THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 108, NO. 20 NEW YORK, MONDAY, MAY 17, 1943 NUMBER 1485

Victory in Tunisia

The fall of Tunis and Bizerte sent a thrill of joy through the entire civilized world. Here was a smashing triumph over Germany, the most dangerous of the Axis partners, a triumph achieved far ahead of the most optimistic time estimates of the experts. As the shattered armies of the enemy reeled back along the road toward Cap Bon, many persons felt, as for some reason they had not done in the Russian victories of last winter, that at last Germany was being paid back in some measure for Warsaw and Rotterdam, for Dunkirk and London and Coventry. Revenge is not a noble emotion, but for people who have suffered in impotent silence, as long and as much as Hitler's enemies have done, there is a satisfying release of the spirit in seeing the barbarians on the run.

The war is not yet won. Indeed, so far as concerns our own participation in it, we may say it has hardly yet started. Yet the most striking fact at present is the universal recognition that if we play our part as we should, victory in the long run is inevitable.

The Narrow Margin

We can now look back and see the desperately narrow margin by which civilization has been saved. If Hitler had been able to continue his policy of separating his enemies from one another and attacking them individually, the hope of successful resistance to him would have been slight indeed. An invasion of England immediately after Dunkirk could hardly have failed to succeed; with England subjugated, if he had let Russia alone and had joined with Japan in an attack on the United States, his prospect of success would have been excellent. It now seems unlikely that we shall ever again, at least in the course of this war, come so near to worldwide disaster as we did when Hitler made his two unbelievable blunders of turning back from the Channel toward Paris and of assaulting the Soviet Union, which certainly had no intention of fighting except in self-defense. Today his historic moment has passed; he is on the defensive everywhere; unrest is growing hourly in occupied Europe; his day moves toward sunset.

Who Can Speak for Poland?

In the controversy between Poland and Russia, the Poles labor under the disadvantage that nobody really knows what kind of government the Polish people would choose if they had the opportunity. This is in some degree a difficulty in the case of all governments in exile: France has supplied an obvious and dramatic case. But though French affairs are troubled, there was at least a constitutional democratic government in Paris before the debacle. We can be still more secure in dealing with the official spokesmen for Czecho-Slovakia, Norway, Holland and certain other nations, though even in their cases a restoration of constitutional government might be followed by a choice of new officials and policies.

But Poland, as we know, has been under a dictatorship for years, and a dictatorship with an unsavory reputation both in international and domestic affairs. In many respects it was as illiberal as the Nazis themselves. This fact offers Russia the opportunity to call into question the reputation of at least some of those now associated with the Polish government in London. Stalin's statement that he favors an independent Po-

CONTENTS

The Week 651

Editorials

From Tunisia to Europe 654
Second-Class Citizens 655
Subsidies and the Rollback 656
Good and Bad News 657

General Articles

Liberals Today and Tomorrow . Bruce Bliven 658
How to Win the Food War . . Helen Fuller 662
Lyric (verse) . . . . . Tom Boggs 663
Italy on the Eve . . . . . Paolo Milano 664
Congress on the Loose . . . . Potomacus 666
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 668
Jus Divinum . . . . . Stark Young 669
Let Us Now Praise Movies . Manny Farber 699
The Bandwagon 670

Correspondence 671

Books in Review

The Newest Machiavelli . . Malcolm Cowley 673
Milton and Our War . . F. O. Matthiessen 674
Winter Soldiers . . . . John C. Miller 675
Synthetic Misanthrope . . . . Alan Barth 676
A Reader's List 677

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land which may be either a friendly neighbor or an ally of Russia must be interpreted with these facts in mind. No doubt he is sincere in this statement, but it is obvious that he does not want a Poland governed as before the war. Neither, if we take the Atlantic Charter seriously, should we. And the probability is that many Polish peasants and workers would agree.

The way out of this dilemma is clearly not to make too many commitments to the present Polish government. We see no reason why Russia, Great Britain and the United States should not agree on the general principle that as soon as feasible after Poland is liberated, the Polish people will be given a democratic opportunity to set up whatever government they wish, and that detailed arrangements must await negotiations with that new government.

Now We Can Start Taxing

While the army is on time—or possibly a little ahead of schedule—in the war against the Axis, Congress is just about six months late in the war on inflation. We say this on the assumption, which may after all be mistaken, that the action of the Senate Committee has decided the issue of how to get tax payments on a current basis. It has voted for the Carlson version of the Ruml plan, which previously came within two votes of winning in the House. This means a clean shift to pay-as-you-go on the basis of 1943 income, with the exception that some of the larger incomes will have to pay on either 1943 or 1942, whichever is higher.

If at last the method of payment is settled, Congress must remember that present rates are not high enough, no matter which year is taken as the basis. This was the real motive of the Treasury in trying to get two years' payment in one; the fault with that plan was that in most cases it would have meant an impossible burden, and it would have lasted only for one year. But that does not mean that we can rest on existing rates. The President's budget message pointed out the necessity of raising $16,000,000,000 more; in our opinion that is not enough. And in spite of Mr. Roosevelt's satisfaction over the recent bond drive, we believe he is mistaken in saying it lessens the need for compulsory savings. Even with the additional taxes he recommended, the Treasury would still have to borrow some $50,000,000,000 from the citizens' current income in order to avoid resort to the banks. Can we not forget the row about the Ruml plan now and settle down to financing the war?

Republicans and Internationalists

Two Republicans have recently sought to repudiate the notion that an international outlook is exclusively the property of the Democratic Party. Wendell Willkie, whose new book "One World" is now appearing serially in The London Daily Telegraph, sent a message to that paper in which he predicted a Republican victory next year and went on to say:

> . . . it would be tragic if people in other lands . . . assumed that a world outlook is the exclusive possession of either political party in the United States. Such an assumption . . . might hamper a Republican administration eager to coöperate with other members of the United Nations to establish a permanent peace and decent living conditions for the whole world.

Russell Davenport, in Fortune magazine, recites in some detail the history of the Republican Party at the turn of the century to prove that leading Republican thinkers were then neither isolationist nor completely imperialist on the British model. He makes a good case for his contention that some outstanding Republicans, if not all, wanted to coöperate with other nations for their common advantage.

Mr. Davenport is right about the days of forty years ago; Mr. Willkie is right about himself, former Governor Stassen and their followers. But in the lack of a complete Gallup Poll of the Republican Party, we have to go by the record that party has made in Congress. Our Washington correspondent pointed out in our issue of May 10 that that record is about as black as it could be. On the five most important subjects dealing with international coöperation, at the beginning of the war, the Republicans in both Houses voted no. A week ago the Senate Republicans voted against just treatment of Panama, 19 to 0; in the House Ways and Means Committee they voted against the Hull treaties, 10 to 1. On these treaties in the past they have voted adversely on three different occasions, by a total of 388 to 15. Americans are a practical people, with little historical sense and much skepticism about idealistic promises. The Republicans are making a record now which makes Mr. Davenport's history and Mr. Willkie's hopes seem equally futile.

Runs, Hits and Errors

We have long despaired of discovering the criteria upon which the Pulitzer Prizes are awarded. The intentions of the founder have been so frequently ignored or strangely interpreted that they hardly provide a clue to the selections. Year by year the choices have ranged from the obvious to the ridiculous, from the surprising to the redundant. This year's choices in history and biography, Esther Forbes's "Paul Revere and the World He Lived In" and Samuel Eliot Morison's "Admiral of the Ocean Sea," fall in the category of the obvious; the poetry award to Robert Frost for the fourth time is redundant, and we regret that the committee failed to welcome the appearance of Karl Shapiro's "Person, Place and Thing." The Pulitzer Committee backed up the potent minority of the New York Drama Critics' Circle in preferring Thornton Wilder's "The Skin of Our Teeth" to Sidney Kingsley's "The Patriots," the Critics' choice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The surprise package was the choice of Upton Sinclair's "Dragon's Teeth" for the fiction prize. The year produced no fiction of great distinction and it is difficult to quarrel with any honor bestowed upon the grand old warhorse of American liberalism, but the selections raises once more the question of what literary criteria are employed in making the award. In view of the fact that no prize for fiction was given last year—the view is widely held that this was to bypass Ernest Hemingway's "For Whom the Bell Tolls," the just and obvious choice—we regret that a similar silence was not observed this year. The ridiculous was reached by the committee in its choice of a cartoon, an undistinguished, anti-New Deal blast by the venerable J. N. Darling of The New York Herald Tribune. May we remind the committee that it has not honored Fitzpatrick of The St. Louis Post-Dispatch since 1926 and that it has never seen fit to recognize the considerable graphic abilities of William Gropper.

The Poll Tax Again

Last week the two hundred and eighteenth member of the House of Representatives signed his name to the petition calling for discharge of the anti-poll-tax bill from the House Judiciary Committee, where it had been held up, just as it was for so many months last session. This time the petition was completed in one day less than two months, record-breaking time for such a task. This accomplishment was the result of a coalition drive led by Democratic, Republican and American Labor representatives. Republican Rep. George Bender of Ohio, who heads the steering committee of the coalition, announced on completion of the petition that the committee "is confident that the House will vote overwhelmingly to abolish this property restriction on suffrage. The passage of this bill will be evidence to our allies that the American people are fighting for democracy and freedom." The anti-poll-tax fighters are certain that this time they can break through the threat of a Senate filibuster, since the bill will be pending throughout 1944 and votes on the measure will be issues before rather than after the election, unlike the situation last year.

Dirty Linen in Public

The White House put the Truman Committee on the spot when it asked the committee to arbitrate the latest fight among Rubber Tsar Jeffers, Undersecretary of War Patterson and Undersecretary of the Navy Forrestal. The Truman Committee was asked to "investigate" only when it was no longer possible to avoid some kind of action in view of what the various partisans had shoved into the public press. Truman dutifully went to work, dutifully called each of the disputants to testify, then last week dutifully issued a report which was not nearly so dutiful as might have been expected. Instead of saying "on the one hand . . . and on the other hand," the committee's report contained some real meat, covered over with a thick sauce of diplomacy. "The problems of balancing complex programs involving the high strategy of war cannot be solved in an open forum," it declared. The trouble came, it went on, in letting disputes like this one reach the point of open, public controversy. According to the committee, power to settle this sort of thing is lodged in the WPB, although the committee is quick to admit that it has never used its powers.

Where the Trouble Lies

The Truman Committee upholds the statement made in these pages two weeks ago that Donald Nelson received no protest over the allocation of critical components from Undersecretary Patterson before that official saw fit to air his case in the press. It also upholds our contention that the real trouble lay in an original failure on the part of War and Navy to set their sights high enough on the question of high-octane-gasoline requirements. Then it goes on to repeat the point so often made in the past by such public servants as Rep. John Tolan and Senators Pepper and Kilgore, that the only answer to this and other problems of war production must lie eventually in the establishment of a single over-all authority for war-production mobilization. This most recent Truman report contends that the WPB has possessed such powers all along, under its directive, and in the gentlest possible language takes the WPB to task for having failed to use this power to its fullest extent. The Truman Committee, by a roundabout route, has now lined up solidly behind the philosophy of the Tolan-Pepper-Kilgore war-mobilization bill, which still stands as the most constructive war-production proposal to date.

Fitzpatrick in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Chief Delegate to Food Conference

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Tunisia to Europe

EVERY VICTORY IS GOOD, but the victory of the Allied forces in Tunisia is especially good for two reasons. One is that it came swiftly and suddenly, ahead of schedule. To be sure, the original schedule our generals had set after our landings in Africa six months ago could not be fulfilled because the Germans concentrated more strength than we had expected. But our troops exceeded the schedule as revised. The complete collapse of the Axis forces took on the tempo and proportions of a blitzkrieg disaster. The second reason is that in their victory the Allied forces displayed the coördination which is the heart of modern war—the exact articulation between the various arms of warfare, and (even more important) the synchronizing of the efforts of British, American and French armies.

In short, this was a United Nations victory in the truest sense of the term. Yet Americans will be pardoned if they show a special pride in the achievement of their troops and generals. Ours is not a seasoned army of veterans, but in the truest sense a citizen army. It is not a group of professionals but a nation which only yesterday was peaceful and today has taken up arms. We are proud that it has so quickly passed through its baptism of fire, grown hardened to the tasks and trials of war and come to maturity.

In the process of smashing the Germans, our army has also laid to rest the myth of the invincibility of German armed might. This does not mean that we can afford to treat German strength and fighting quality lightly in the future. Far from it. The Germans showed throughout the Tunisian fighting that they still were good technicians and stubborn fighters, and that they still had a lot of tricks left in their military repertory. But they also showed that when the pressure gets hot enough, they collapse before it. It is not our present purpose to ask why. Some American psychologists have advanced the theory that the structure of authority in the German family is so completely paternalistic that Germans grow up incapable of thinking for themselves and incapable therefore of meeting the trials of adversity as well as they press the advantage of victory. This is both ingenious and convincing. Yet whatever one may think of the theory, the fact is there.

And it is a fact which may shed some light on the events to come during the next year. From Tunisia our armies will move on to Europe. Of that there can be no doubt. How difficult and bloody will the invasion be? What will be its chances of success and its pace of success?

One result of the Tunisian victory will be to clear the Mediterranean of Axis obstruction to our shipping along the southern route. This will affect the fighting fronts of the United Nations in Russia and as far as Burma. It will also make infinitely easier the problem of supplying and mounting an invasion against what Mr. Churchill once called the "soft underside" of Europe. We cannot tell, of course, whether an invasion of Italy will be the major Allied move now. But whatever the general plan of invasion, it is fairly logical that the Allied generals will include Sicily, Sardinia and Italy in them in the near future. Already the largest single concentration of American planes that has ever made a European raid—four hundred of them—has laid Palermo, in Sicily, in ruins.

But the best military commentary today seems inclined to the view that our invasion of Europe will involve not single but multiple landings. In the south—southern France, Italy and the Balkans; in the west—an invasion of France taking off from the English ports; in the north—a Norwegian invasion; in the east—a new and all-out Russian offensive: these are the possibilities, whether in partial or complete combination. It would seem to make good tactical sense to attack Hitler simultaneously at as many points as possible, if we can solve the problems of shipping, manpower and supply. This would cause him to disperse his forces, already spread thinner than ever; it would weaken any possible concentration of the Luftwaffe, which the Germans have evidently been hoarding against the coming invasion; and it would make the task of policing Europe to prevent acts of sabotage and of collaboration with the invaders an almost impossible one for Himmler.

The cost of the invasion cannot help being great. But it will be minimized by careful preparation, by a canny distribution of strength as between the various invasion points, by complete synchronizing of the forces engaged and by a proper use of political warfare. We at home must not make the mistake of putting pressure on the generals to move their invasion plans forward recklessly. The Tunisian campaign showed that time used for massing our strength was more than compensated for by the quickness with which the enemy collapsed once the full attack was launched.

The area in which civilian advice to the generals and political leaders is really relevant is the area of political warfare. Hitler and Goebbels have been trying desperately to minimize the implications of their Tunisian defeat: the strategy of gloom, employed after the Nazi disasters at Stalingrad, and elsewhere in Russia, is not being used now. Instead the Nazi propaganda lords are relying on the idea of a Festung-Europa—a European fortress within which all the European people are united against the invasion attempts of England, Russia and America. It is a clever propaganda concept, stressing both the strength and the unity of Europe. But neither exists to anything like the extent the Nazis claim. The European fortress can in the long run be only as strong as Germany's industrial strength, her transport system, her capacity to keep her supply and communication lines functioning under continuous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aerial attack. And European unity is a fantastic creation of the Nazi imagination, as the epidemic of new sabotage attempts and new Nazi suppression attempts all over Europe have testified during the past two weeks. On the brink of invasion, Europe is in turmoil. And the turmoil will grow as the hour of invasion comes ever nearer.

Perhaps this is the reason why the State Department seems recently to have been behaving reasonably well. It would be fatal to the coöperation which our invasion forces must have from the underground if they thought that once we had power we would turn it over, as we did in North Africa, to those who once collaborated with the Germans. For the sake of our whole future and the future of Europe, we must play fair with the underground and with the democratic movements in Europe.

Second-Class Citizens

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS have been profoundly shocked during the past few weeks by the relation between the coal miners and the rest of the country. Despite the general pledge of all labor not to strike in wartime, half a million miners laid down their tools on a Saturday and most of them did not go back to work until the following Tuesday, after having been ordered to do so both by the President and—what seems to have been far more important in their eyes—by their leader, John L. Lewis. These half-million men seem to be entirely prepared to strike once more at the end of the fifteen-day period of grace which Mr. Lewis doled out to the government. Indignation against them is running high.

Yet it is generally agreed among thoughtful citizens that the miners had genuine grievances and that the operators acted badly in refusing to consider their demands and in trying to force the case into the hands of the government. The ceiling on wages caught the miners in a position where they are worse off than many other people doing jobs that are less dangerous and require less skill. The average miner gets $41 per week and sees construction men or shipyard workers earning wages that are higher by 50 percent or even more. Naturally, he has a sense of injustice that is not dissipated merely because he is reminded that to break the wage ceilings will bring on inflation, and that the soldier in the trenches is forbidden to strike and gets only a small wage.

There is no denying that, tactically, the miners are in a powerful strategic position. To mine coal is highly expert and dangerous work, involving not only the use of explosives, but machinery at the face of the seam. John L. Lewis is right in one thing: you can't mine coal with bayonets. If we were to arrest the whole 450,000 miners and put them in jail, or in the army, as a lot of hot-heads are recommending, it would be very difficult indeed to train another 450,000 men to take their places. There would be practically no coal mining for a good many weeks, and there would be very little for months. Moreover, to draw off 450,000 able-bodied men from other occupations would be a fatal blow to our whole economy. It is interesting to see that many of those who most fiercely denounce the miners are elderly men who haven't done a day's manual work in forty years and would be entirely useless if they tried it. Incidentally, when such men talk about forcing miners to dig coal or else go into the army, they are doubtless unaware of the deadly insult they are offering to every man and woman in the armed forces of the United States. To wear your country's uniform is the highest patriotic service that a citizen can perform. It is outrageous to try to make it identical with a prison sentence.

As for the financial aspect of the miners' demands: it is quite true that we must hold the line against inflation; but it is also true that many people who say this sternly at the present moment are doing so chiefly in order to vent their spleen against the miners, or against trade unionism in general. They said nothing of the kind when Congress was debating the President's order limiting salaries to $25,000; they have been silent while hundreds of corporation officials have recently voted themselves fat increases in salaries that were already huge.

Every official statement on the subject of the wage ceiling, from the beginning, has said that inequities and substandard wages should be corrected. The miners' wage is substandard. It is inequitable in comparison with the pay in other occupations of equal skill and danger. The world will not come to an end, nor will the danger of inflation be increased in any serious degree, if the miners are given a modest increase in their actual annual earnings. It will certainly be well to do this without increasing their hourly rates, by a guarantee of work six days a week and portal-to-portal pay. No doubt it is true that this will then be followed by demands from workers in other industries that their pay shall be raised. Such demands should be examined on their merit, and when they are just, they should be granted. The danger of serious inflation is greatly lessened now that the administration at last is making a real attempt to use subsidies and thereby to roll back prices to the level of six months ago.

But the problem of the miners has not been solved when the danger of a strike is ended and they are back at work under a new long-time agreement. For we still have the unanswered question: why did the miners apparently feel a greater loyalty to John L. Lewis than to the government of their own country as personified by the President for whom the great majority of them had voted? Why were they willing to go on strike in the middle of a war, when thousands

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of members of their own families are fighting on fronts all over the world? (On this last point, it is no answer to say that few coal miners have been drafted; 150,000 of them in recent years have left the mines and entered other, less deferrable, occupations.)

Here we strike deep into a problem in mass psychology that is of tremendous importance. For decades, middle-class opinion as expressed through the columns of a large majority of the important newspapers of the United States has been hostile to trade unionism. The normal history is that the press and other media for expression of opinion forget all about any union between strikes; but as soon as a labor controversy arises, and without troubling to hear both sides of the case, the verdict is pronounced against the workers. That this should be so is due to several causes. The union men frequently state their case very badly, or not at all; for years John L. Lewis, for example, openly scoffed at public opinion and refused to pay the slightest attention to it, though he has now changed his tune. (In the present crisis, the United Mine Workers have resorted to paid advertising, which unfortunately was clumsily worded and badly argued.) Second, the employers are usually much better skilled in public relations. Sometimes they are heavy advertisers, influential for that reason. Always, they are, so to speak, fraternity brothers of the publishers, members of the same country club, talking the same language.

It is not surprising therefore that the miners, like other trade unionists, should develop an inferiority complex which makes them feel that they stand alone in a hostile world. When you appeal to their patriotism, they might well tell you that always in the past when they have tried to get better working conditions or more money, moral and ethical arguments have been used against them. They are always being told that babies will freeze if they strike to support their claims; and often they know that these arguments are false, that there are coal reserves adequate to cover the emergency. They are aware that steel mills have been known to shut down dramatically but needlessly amid a blare of trumpets in order to help the coal operators to drive home their point with the public. It is not surprising, then, that the miners should cling to a man like Lewis who, for all his faults, has for many years satisfied their need of a "father image" and has stood by them when every other man's hand was against them.

We repeat that the attitude of the miners is to be found in greater or less degree throughout the whole trade-union movement. Middle-class liberals are forever being shocked by the bitterness and prejudice displayed by trade unionists against the press and their employers. Such liberals overlook the fact that the trade unionist is forced to be eternally on the defensive. A man like Westbrook Pegler no doubt thinks of himself as a friend of good unions and good unionists. He writes about the crooks and racketeers, of whom there are admittedly a good many, and of whom the movement certainly ought to be purged. Unfortunately, by spending his whole time on the bad 10 percent and never saying anything about the good 90 percent, by never coming to the aid of the unions when they are under unjust attack, he does two things: he gives his readers the impression that all unions are infested with gangsters, and he gives the unions the impression that he is just another open-shopper. And Pegler is only the most conspicuous of many writers and speakers who help to create the same total picture, little coral builders busily creating an atoll of falsehood.

This breach between the unionists and the rest of the country, extremely harmful in wartime, is also bad in peace. Yet it is neither necessary nor inevitable. The British have managed to get along without it; true, it flared up momentarily in the general strike of 1926, but it is almost extinct today. Sooner or later we have got to realize not only that trade unions are the best guarantee against merciless exploitation by the employer, but that they satisfy a profound human need to belong to something, something smaller and more concrete than a nation or a state. Until we have learned that lesson, and put it into effect, we shall continue to have large masses of citizens whose defensive psychology drives them into positions which will seem shocking and even outrageous to those who stand outside the group.

Subsidies and the Rollback

THREE WEEKS AGO Price Administrator Prentiss Brown told housewives that he was going to restore the value of their dollars to what they were worth before inflation began in earnest. Last week the OPA showed signs of a real intention to live up to Brown's promise. Of course, so major a step could not be taken as fast as a consumer could say "Prentiss Brown," but it was clear that the price-controllers were getting wound up to take probably their most important step since they came into being.

General agreement was evident on the most fundamental point involved in Brown's price-control problem—to subsidize or not to subsidize. "To subsidize" is to be the answer. Since the OPA is not allowed to spend its currently appropriated funds for this purpose under its congressional mandate, Jesse Jones is to be allowed the privilege of putting up the money for the subsidy program from his stringless and practically limitless RFC funds. On June 1, there will be a 10-percent rollback of consumer prices on beef, veal, pork, lamb, mutton, coffee and butter by flat payments to processors on condition that they cut their prices accordingly. Meanwhile community-wide prices on some six hundred items have already gone into effect in one hundred and fifty regions (one hundred cities with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

100,000 population and over, plus approximately fifty mining towns). Brown promises that dollar-and-cents ceilings will be placed on remaining foods by June 1 in these areas.

The White House is also calling for a 25 to 40-percent rollback without benefit of subsidies on fresh-vegetable prices, which have gone completely out of sight in recent weeks. It was thought that putting these policies into operation would roll back the cost of living to September 15, 1942, levels. But it is not yet entirely clear from what levels the rollback is to take place. There is some peculiar arithmetic involved in the computations to date.

Seasonal declines in some prices are coming along to confuse the rollback issue; the new community-wide ceilings cover only the small stores, on the supposition that all chain stores are abiding by the present ceiling regulations; the OPA enforcement staff is now still limited to 2,500 investigators in all, 1,000 for farm products and foods. As things now stand, the OPA will be able to assign only 250 investigators to this new control program. There are 550,000 retail food stores in the country. Reported plans are to confine the 250 retail investigators to the 52,000 large outlets, or superstores, not covered by the new maximum order. That will make one investigator for every two hundred stores. Any housewife in the country could tell Prentiss Brown that that is not enough, if he or his staff would take the time to ask her.

Yet this latest OPA policy announcement is by far the best thing that has yet appeared on price control. The present plan is probably the best action program that can be carried out with the limited staff and facilities available to the OPA. The only trouble is that it is overadvertised at a time when a great deal more needs to be done. Most immediately, the new ceiling plan must be extended to all large superstores and to all the other areas of the country in addition to the 150 now covered.

Good and Bad News

FOR WEEKS BOTH the AFL and the CIO leaders have been doing a manful job of sitting on the lid, holding down angry, inflationary demands from their constituents, who were less concerned with the general situation than with the shrinkage that had set in on weekly paychecks. Workers' wives found their dollar bills worth less in terms of buying power almost every time they went to market, and by last week it had got plenty tough for loyal labor leaders to explain to their fellow members why they were not following John Lewis' lead in demanding wage increases to match past rises in the cost of living.

Last week nobody was giving the top AFL and CIO leadership the credit it deserved for statesmanlike handling of an almost impossible situation. But these men felt reward enough in seeing tangible signs of the OPA movement toward price control. That is what they had pleaded for, and had lately been promising their membership in return for a little bit more faith in the administration for just a little while longer.

Meanwhile, to make it really tough for labor to stay in line, the reactionaries of the Senate moved in on the tail of public concern over the coal-mine strike to rush through the Connally anti-strike bill by a vote of 63 to 16. It gives the President power to take over factories on strike, to freeze all working conditions as of that time, no matter how bad they may be, and it provides penalties for anyone who aids in inducing workers to strike or aids them after the strike is in effect, with funds or otherwise. Senator Taft said the bill was aimed "not against the membership, but against the union leaders."

The anti-laborites in the House then immediately sprang into action. The Connally bill was scheduled for action without hearings. That wildest-eyed labor-baiter of them all, Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia, did not lose any time in getting down to some heavy "conferrin'" on how to put teeth into the Connally bill. Probably Howard will push his own vicious brand of anti-strike legislation either as an amendment to the Connally bill in the House or as a substitute for whatever comes out of committee. Whichever it turns out to be, it is bad news for labor.

While all this was going on, the War Labor Board was struggling with its own soul, groaning over the remains of the Little Steel order, delivering ultimata about its function to Economic Stabilizer Byrnes, applauding talk about a price rollback. The chances are that Byrnes will return to the WLB the power to modify the "hold the line" order with respect to wages in some particulars. If he doesn't, the chances are that some of the members of the present War Labor Board will soon be heading for home, of their own accord.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberals Today and Tomorrow

In recent months, nearly all American liberals have been profoundly unhappy about the political aspect of the war. Miss Pearl Buck has said publicly that she feels this war must be followed by another one in order to release the people of Asia and Africa from domination by the white man. Vice President Wallace has warned that failure to deal properly with Soviet Russia might result in another conflict. Numerous other persons have expressed the fear that the peace settlement will be of such a character as to bring about a third world war, or that class conflicts within the European nations will be suppressed and will smolder for years with a constant danger of breaking out into bloody conflict.

If we try to look realistically at the facts of the world, we see a good deal of basis for the liberals' pessimism. Increasingly in recent months there have been multiple signs that some of the key figures in the United Nations governments consider this just another old-fashioned war to be followed by an old-fashioned peace and—though they try not to think about it—quite possible by another old-fashioned war, and so on. The British Tory Party, which in general appears to take this attitude, has grown more and more cocky and self-assertive with the military successes of the past few months. In so far as the British Empire is imperialistic—and without now stopping to argue just how far that is—it is perfectly clear that the present rulers intend to tolerate no important change. From the standpoint of the ruling forces in Great Britain, this is not a war for democracy in any sense of a sudden worldwide application of the doctrine of brotherhood of men, whether economic or social. It is a war of defense against aggressive fascism in Germany, Japan and Italy. The Tory Party is stronger than it has been in a long time; Labor is bound to its chariot wheel and in any case seems feeble and uncertain in its own policies. While there is a vigorous new movement on the Left, it comprises thus far only a tiny minority of the electorate. We must not forget, however, that as far as Great Britain herself is concerned, sweeping social changes have taken place, under the whip of necessity, in the past few decades. "Tory Socialism" in that country has already redistributed wealth to a degree that would cause wholesale apoplexy if seriously proposed in the United States.

What about the other important allies? I am aware of no evidence that Stalin has altered his ideology a particle under the pressure of war. Long ago, as Sir Bernard Pares pointed out the other day in The New Republic, Stalin lost such interest as he had ever had in immediate worldwide communist revolution and began concentrating his efforts on the development of Russia itself, and especially on preparing her to meet attack. Under the pressure of war emotion and particularly because of our gratitude and admiration for the heroic defense conducted by the Red Army, we have a tendency to forget the things about Russia to which we formerly objected—the merciless wholesale execution of political opponents, the universal spying, the ruthless carrying out of arbitrary economic plans; but they are still there, and they will probably be there when peace is declared. So will the good aspects of Russia, the abolition of race, class and sex prejudice, the universal passion for education, the fine sense of "belongingness" which every citizen feels and which is reflected in every day and hour of life.

We have just had disillusioning evidence, in the Russo-Polish boundary dispute, that post-war readjustments between Soviet Russia and the rest of the world will not be automatic and simple. None of the problems is insuperable; but they are difficult enough to make us realize that after the fighting is over the hardest part of our job may be still to come.

It would be a mistake, for one thing, to assume lightly that after Germany and Italy have been defeated, Russia will immediately declare war on Japan and help us to finish off the Asiatic part of the struggle in short order. It is far from certain that Russia will do any such thing. The Russians have never, so far as one can recall, undertaken serious and dangerous adventures outside their own boundaries for altruistic reasons; and even if they were inclined to do so, they would be discouraged if the war is of the character that it appears to be, and that Mr. Churchill says it is. Why should Russians die to maintain the British, Dutch or French empires in the Far East?

Of course, it may be argued that Japan is also an enemy of Russia, and that from the purely selfish point of view it would be wise for her to join the fight and make sure of finishing off a dangerous potential foe. But the Russians might easily decide that Britain and America are capable of doing this without any help; and if they are not, she might conceivably reckon that with a strong army in Siberia she could keep the Japanese at bay for many years without the necessity of ever firing a shot.

As for China, admiration for her heroic resistance runs high in this country, and deservedly so. But as with our admiration for Russia, it should not blind us to the facts of the case. China is now very far from being a political democracy on the Western model. The winning of the war might or might not increase the forces within China that are pushing her in a demo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic direction. Madame Chiang is a magnificent personality, and her husband is a man of tremendous native force and ability. But political democracy does not necessarily grow from such soil as this. In any case, China's attitude is not much comfort to the disillusioned Western liberal, for China is a victim of, and not a participant in, the social and economic inequalities associated with white imperialism.

When we consider the countries that are now occupied by the Axis, France, Greece, Norway and the rest, we must recognize that in most of them there are unfulfilled social revolutions which, when the Axis troops marched in, were frozen for the period of the war. Presumably when the Fascist powers are defeated, and assuming that the United Nations do not interfere to prevent a continued struggle, these social revolutions will go forward, each at its own pace, with or without violence. Nearly all Americans would hope that, in each case, the outcome would be a victory for liberalism, power being taken neither by the reactionaries nor by the communists, who have shown little regard for the personal freedom of the individual which to political democrats like ourselves is of so much importance. But there is no automatic guarantee that this will be true, and that these various revolutions—if they take place—will turn out to our liking. At the present moment, in fact, there seems to be a legitimate basis for some fear that the American government might use its influence to try to freeze the status quo ante in certain countries, even though this means perpetuating fascist or semi-fascist regimes.

This brings us to the question whether in the eyes of the Americans at present, this war is a simple matter of defense against aggression or a war for democracy. Actually, of course, it is several kinds of war at once. It is one thing to one man and another to another; and even a single individual may have a different attitude at different times.

It is conspicuously true that Mr. Roosevelt has refrained from putting the sort of noble interpretation upon the present struggle that Woodrow Wilson put upon the First World War. In not doing so, no doubt he has been influenced partly by the fiasco of Wilsonian idealism. He is determined to make no promises to his fellow countrymen unless he is reasonably sure that they will be fulfilled. He is equally determined not to repeat Wilson's unhappy experience of making promises to the rest of the world on behalf of his fellow countrymen only to have them repudiated by the Senate. It is probably well that we should not indulge in Utopian wishes which we have no intention of fulfilling. If the chilly and niggardly promises of the Atlantic Charter are the best we can do, it is perhaps a good thing to know it now and not break our hearts later. But is it true that this represents our best?

Mr. Roosevelt has let Mr. Churchill set the pace and dictate the tone in regard to the character of the war and the almost complete absence of official discussion of the post-war world. (Both of them of course are profoundly influenced by Stalin.) He has pointedly kept his hands off in regard to India, although he has been under heavy pressure to act. In domestic matters, no one has seemed to read more pessimistically than he the significance of last year's congressional elections. One by one, the New Dealers have departed from Washington or have been left chewing their pencils and gazing at immaculate, empty desks. Even on such a vital issue as greater equality for the Negro, he has listened to advisers who have told him that in the national emergency the support of white Southerners who might be outraged is more important than the support of Negroes throughout the country who would be electrified with joy if they got news that some of their heavy burden of social and economic discrimination was to be lifted.

Mr. Roosevelt seems to believe that whatever the war may become, it is at present a status-quo struggle, to be fought with status-quo weapons. He let the State Department sell him a dubious policy of continued appeasement of Franco and of the Vichyites in North Africa, evidently believing that immediate military questions are more important now than ultimate moral values. He has refused to fight very hard for his friends, such as Leon Henderson or Mayor LaGuardia, when they were under attack from a Congress where a majority is on most subjects hostile to him. As for the report of the NRPB, a document squarely in the center of the New Deal tradition, he gingerly left it as a May basket on Congress' doorstep, rang the bell and ran away. The President has never been more of a liberal than he felt he could afford to be at any given moment; moreover, much of his liberalism has always been an impromptu and ad-hoc product, the result of someone's coming along with a good liberal idea at just the right moment. Today, the men who come along at the right moment are hardboiled generals, admirals and big-business executives with billion-dollar war contracts.

To what does this all add up so far as the liberals are concerned? A few points are worth mentioning.

First, it is perfectly true that the most important thing in the world at present is to beat the Axis on the field of battle. If it wins, the whole world will go fascist, probably for decades, if not centuries. If it were true that continued devotion to the New Deal hampered the war effort, then the New Deal should be laid on the shelf. And the alternative is also true: if the wave of conservatism is hurting the war, it, also, should be suspended for the duration.

Second, some liberals have perhaps been naïve in supposing that the war has changed the minds of the leaders of various countries. Experience with human nature proves that very few adults can have their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minds changed on any subject. Men like Churchill, Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek keep silent during the war, for diplomatic reasons, about those of their opinions and policies which may strike a disagreeable note among the populations of Allied countries; but they don't abandon these beliefs and policies. During war, there is always an illusion of greater unanimity than in fact exists. This was true in the First World War, and many hearts were broken, after peace had come, to see how quickly the "gallant and united" Allies reverted to bitter quarrels among themselves over divergent national aims.

Third, the liberals, who are themselves persons of an altruistic tendency, probably tend to exaggerate the degree of altruism in the American population as a whole. I would agree that we are the most generous, unselfish people on earth; but this a contest in which you don't need to be very good to win. Vice President Wallace was badly misunderstood when he expressed the desire that ultimately everybody in the world might have the privilege of drinking a quart of milk every day. It was assumed that he meant we should give away this quart of milk, and an NAM spokesman promptly said the United States was not fighting to give a quart of milk to every Hottentot in Africa every day. This and similar comments were only about what might have been expected. Broadly speaking, the Americans don't intend to give away very much, over a long period of time; you may deplore this if you like, but you cannot alter it in a hurry. Our post-war planning should therefore be based on arrangements that are as much to the benefit of this country as of anyone else. And as a matter of fact this offers a sound basis for a worldwide economy. Permanent peace is just as much to our interest as that of any other nation. A high standard of prosperity and employment in this country is almost impossible without a similar high standard in the other countries where live the potential customers for our exported goods. If the Hottentot can sell us goods that we want, and can buy, either from us or elsewhere, his daily quart of milk, you have a basis for a solid long-time organization. Any scheme based on altruism, on the contrary, is subject to termination without notice because of a change of attitude on the part of the altruor toward the altruee.

Fourth, many liberals have a tendency to overestimate the strength of the New Deal element in the Democratic Party in the United States, not only now but ever since 1933. We should know better where we stand if we recognized frankly that the party, as it existed on the day that Roosevelt took power, was not very liberal, and had not won the election of 1932 on any such basis. A glance at the 1932 Democratic platform or the chief campaign speeches of Mr. Roosevelt and others, will confirm the truth of this observation. Mr. Roosevelt became a New Dealer after he got into office and, as noted above, on an ad-hoc, day-to-day basis. He surrounded himself with an unusual group of men and women with a progressive outlook, and item by item, they sold him the various parts of the New Deal program. They were helped in doing so by the fact that, year after year, the depression continued to be so serious that almost any experiment seemed better than just to let matters drift. But the Southern Democratic leaders never were convinced in their hearts that the New Deal was a good thing, and they deserted the ship as soon as they felt it was safe to do so. The same, broadly speaking, is true of the corrupt big-city Democratic machines of the North. The life of the New Deal depended to an extraordinary extent on two forces: the continued support of the President himself, and the continued support of the inarticulate poor people of the country, union members, sharecroppers, taxi drivers, elevator men, street-car motormen, who gave the President his tremendous majorities in the elections and probably represented an even larger proportion of the total population, since they are the people who most easily lose, or are intimidated out of, their rights at the polls. But for many decades prior to 1933 the politicians of the two big parties had been in conspiracy, tacit or overt, to thwart the wishes of these masses. Today that conspiracy exists again. Except for a handful of progressives in Congress, the President himself is now almost the only friend of the common man at court. This may seem a grim picture; but it is better to be grim and correct than to take a rosy view that turns out to be wrong.

In the fifth place, some American liberals have delusions of grandeur as to the extent of our influence upon our Allies, both now and in the post-war period. They feel that if we only insist hard enough, we can force the other United Nations to follow the general policies that we lay down. But in fact this is not true. The argument that we can dictate to other countries because we are supplying them with vital war weapons overlooks the fact that this struggle is for us also one of self-defense. If England had not held out, our chance of winning when Hitler got around to attacking us, as he certainly would have done, would have been pretty slim. If Russia had not been drawn into the war —and this took place, remember, only because Hitler indulged in the incredible folly of attacking her—England and America together might have had only a slim chance of winning. There is not a nickel's worth of noble unselfishness in our sending war materials to Britain or Russia. What it really means is that we are arranging for a smaller proportion of our own young men to be killed in the grim march toward victory than might otherwise have been necessary.

We might as well face the fact that beyond certain things that I shall mention in a moment, there is nothing we can do to make sure that the problems of Europe and Asia are solved in ways that are to our liking. In regard to the Russo-Polish dispute, for example:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we can certainly do much by way of conciliation and mediation; indeed, if the United Nations were really a going concern, the dispute need never have burst out in the form it did. Granting all this, it is still true that we cannot actually compel a settlement to our liking unless we are prepared to go to war with one or both powers to dictate a set of terms; and as far as Russia is concerned, we would almost certainly lose such a war. We have no better way to compel Great Britain to solve the Indian question to our liking than the British have of compelling us to solve, let us say, the future of Puerto Rico to their liking. We should be as careful to avoid a Messianic complex as we should be to avoid an accompanying delusion of grandeur. The United States is at this moment probably the strongest nation on earth, though potentially Soviet Russia is stronger, and even now the margin between our productive capacity and that of the British is less than most people believe. But even so, there is no possible way for us to compel the rest of the world to accept our ideas on any subject. It is a case of reason or nothing.

Does all this add up to a basis for defeatism on the part of American liberals? Not for a second. If the fight is harder than some of us may have momentarily and mistakenly supposed, it is nevertheless a fight completely worthwhile. If at times our future looks black, as it does at present, it is nevertheless true that we have a fair fighting chance of ultimate victory, which is as much as any sensible person will ever ask.

The liberal, confused and disheartened by events from day to day, needs to look at things, oftener than most of us do, in historical perspective. When he does so, he sees that during nearly all the recorded past, injustice and the arbitrary power of force have been the general rule. The conception of the dignity of the individual, of freedom and fairness for all, is a startlingly new one.

And looking specifically, again, at the nearer future, let us not forget that—if we assume an Axis defeat, as we are bound to do—the important world currents are running in our favor. First of all, in liberal democracy lies the only real hope of permanent world peace in the next fifty years. Fascist totalitarianism thrives only on war; the external policy of communist totalitarianism is usually peaceful, but communism shows no signs of being able to capture the machinery of government of the United Nations if we are successful in war. We now know that violent social revolution, representing a complete break with the past, never takes place in any country that is not already utterly prostrate and bankrupt.

Time is on our side, also, in domestic matters. The history of internal reform is that the Tories first violently oppose suggested improvements, then reluctantly accept them, then come to regard such improvements as foundation stones of society for which they, the Tories, are somehow responsible. No one should suppose that even if a Bricker or a Dewey becomes President in 1945, old-age security, unemployment insurance or control of Wall Street speculation will be scrapped. It is even unlikely, in my judgment, that collective bargaining will be seriously impaired, despite all the loud talk against it. Union men and women—and their families—have too many votes.

I don't mean to suggest, of course, that anyone should be complacent about the prospect of a Bricker or a Dewey in the White House. I feel they should be fought. Even if the conservatives do not usually tear down the work of their progressive predecessors, they try to sit tight and preserve the status quo. In a world like that of today, mere inaction, mere facing toward the past, may be fatal.

The United States cannot dictate to other nations; but we can coöperate with them. By so doing we can give a powerful impetus to a decent and permanent world order; and by solving our internal problems we can offer an invaluable object lesson to the rest of the world. It is therefore of the greatest possible importance that American liberals should organize and fight for sane policies both at home and abroad. In the center of that fight will be the liberal elements in the trade-union movement, powerful in the movement itself and representing, with enlightened elements in agriculture and middle-class progressives, the greatest force for fairness and good will we have today. We do not need to fold our hands in resignation and say that perhaps a hundred years from now the affirmative society will exist. We shall do well if in a hundred years we have solved the major problems that now confront the world, to say nothing of the new ones that will have arisen during the next century. But no realistic student of human nature expects the millennium, whether in ten, a hundred, or a thousand years. All we can ask is that we progress toward the goal that eventually humanity shall live up to its implicit best.

But here again, there is no reason for complacency or the slightest relaxation of our effort. It is literally true that we stand at this moment at a great historical dividing line. The influence of the United States can be of paramount importance; the influence of the liberals in helping to determine what our American policy shall be, can be equally important. As Michael Straight remarks in his book, "Make This the Last War": "Because the industrial nations must be the leaders in any world organization, to resolve the internal crisis of their social structures by achieving the affirmative society is the most important of all conditions of world peace. For only a happy society can afford to be peaceful and only in a society in which all citizens are conscious of being fully used for constructive enterprises, can happiness be attained." Here is a big enough job for American liberals, a job ready at hand and one where the chance of victory is as good as we can ask.

BRUCE BLIVEN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Win the Food War

SCIENCE has shown us how to increase our production of vitally needed war foods without additional manpower or machinery—but this information, though available, is not being used. Our agricultural experts know how to produce 30 to 60 percent more meat and eggs and dairy products, so much in demand here and on all the battle fronts of the world. Not by black magic, but by P_2O_5, phosphorus pentoxide, the life-giving elements made available to the farmer in phosphatic plant food.

P_2O_5 is nothing new, but the application and testing of it is. Progressive agriculturists have for years insisted on it as the greatest conditioner of depleted or inactive soil, but the fertilizer trust has never seen its way clear to putting the discoveries of these experts into practice. The dozen or so Big Boys of fertilizer and the more than nine hundred fertilizer "mixers," not to be outdone by other selfish interests in our industrial life, are holding firm on the status-quo line, despite all scientific findings on what our land needs to ensure the fullest production of war foods.

It is the claim of those who know most about the experiments with phosphatic fertilization, carried forward particularly under the Tennessee Valley Authority, that the basic problem of food supply is land power; and that thus far our federal food administrators have concerned themselves only with remedies and palliatives, not with fundamental solutions. They point to the conclusive findings of the TVA on experiments conducted by 42,000 farmers in 29 states under the direction of Dr. H. A. Morgan. For years Dr. Morgan had been an enthusiastic student and exponent of the increased production value of phosphates. When he was named a TVA director, he undertook supervision of fertilizer experiments, in which the 42,000 individual farmers mentioned above put an average of seventeen pounds of phosphate on every acre devoted to crop, meadow and pasture, as compared with a normal average of only two pounds per acre for similar lands in the country as a whole. The results have surprised even Dr. Morgan. The farmer-experimenters report more milk from each cow, more eggs from every hen. Their livestock weighs more. Their cash income rises.

As far back as 1935 Dr. Morgan was telling Congress that just such results would come from building a real "fighting soil." Dr. Morgan had carefully explained that the need of the soil for nitrogen is always greater than the amount supplied by fertilizers, especially in wartime, when explosives take up production facilities. Long before the present war he reminded the legislators that nitrogen can also be captured from the air itself by the use of phosphates and other minerals, combined with the planting of legumes, without dependence on commercial fertilizers. Three pounds of nitrogen could be captured from the air for every pound of P_2O_5 applied.

European countries have been using phosphates in enormous quantities for many years. As long ago as 1928 Holland was using forty pounds per acre, as compared with our two; Denmark, twenty, and New Zealand used an average of sixty-five pounds per acre.

As for Germany and Japan, we did not limit our gifts of war materials to oil and scrap. We sent them phosphates too, totaling together almost three million tons of this great food-grower between 1935 and 1939. Since the war has been under way, Britain has found that one shipload of phosphates is practically equivalent to seven shiploads of food. From 1933 to July, 1942, after most phosphate supplies had been diverted to military or Lend-Lease duty, P_2O_5 had been responsible for the equivalent of an increased food production of 150,000,000 pounds of beef or 1,200,000 pounds of milk in this country.

This startling evidence meant less than nothing to those in whose power it was to extend these tremendous advantages to all American agriculture. Until Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama presented his carefully organized documentation of the case last week, public knowledge of this food potential was practically nonexistent. The length and the depth of Hill's speech did not do much to win a wider following for his cause. Even habitual readers of The Congressional Record skipped his sixteen-page statement. Very few went far enough to digest his three-point proposal for putting phosphates to work in our fight to provide enough food to win the war and the peace. He proposed: (1) Forcing full utilization of existing commercial fertilizer capacity by federal purchase of all possible additional output of these plants; (2) construction of the already authorized P_2O_5 plant at Mobile, Alabama, to increase capacity for high-concentrate plant-food production; (3) preparation of designs for immediate post-war construction of government plants to process the large Western phosphate deposits hitherto unworked.

The TVA and Senator Hill, and all those who want the greatest possible food production in the United States in the immediate future, regardless of obstacles, have not met with the full coöperation of the War Production Board, or even of the Department of Agriculture. When war came, the TVA naturally had to divert most of its phosphorus capacity to war uses and increase its Lend-Lease allotments too, since Britain, especially, needed the greatest possible amount of concentrates. With an eye to coming food shortages, the TVA put in a request for a new P_2O_5 plant at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mobile. Congress authorized the plant and appropriated funds for its construction. But the WPB's Chemicals Branch, which includes representatives of Virginia-Carolina Chemical and Allied Dye and Chemical, among other fertilizer producers, under present "patent medicine" methods did not see fit to approve this expanded phosphate capacity which clearly offered a post-war threat to the high-cost, wasteful fertilizer trust of today. Such cases of WPB dollar-a-year reluctance are sometimes overcome by pressure from another, more expert, agency. In the case of the Mobile phosphate plant, strangely enough, the Department of Agriculture was not eager to act. The Department of Agriculture's timidity, its failure to stand up and yell for extension of the phosphate program begun by the TVA, is even less understandable in view of the fact that the AAA has for several years past coöperated with the TVA in the experimental program which, by its own testimony, achieved remarkable results.

Even a short talk with any responsible Agriculture official concerned with this question produces the impression that the Department anticipates sharp opposition from the American Farm Bureau Federation if and when it ever enters upon a phosphate program along TVA lines. There can be little doubt that the Department's political instinct is right. Even a hasty survey of the relationships of the Farm Bureau and Farm Bureau officials to the fertilizer trust produces too much evidence of their coöperation to include in an article of this length. Everyone remembers, for instance, that Chester Gray, while Washington representative of the FBF back in the twenties, worked to obtain a Muscle Shoals contract for the American Cyanamid Company, and struggled to prevent government operation of Muscle Shoals or careful examination of the terms under which American Cyanamid was to take over the operation. Edward A. O'Neal, now president of the FBF, was then chairman of its National Legislative Committee and consequently Gray's boss during the time that the latter was in effect representing the wishes of American Cyanamid and Henry Ford in blocking federal low-cost operation of the Shoals fertilizer plant. Perhaps the Farm Bureau has changed its approach to the fertilizer question. But the testimony of O'Neal on the 1944 agricultural-appropriations bill doesn't indicate it. He personally testified before the Cannon subcommittee that the AAA-TVA joint phosphate program should be discontinued because it departed from the usual system of distributing fertilizer through middlemen. The National Association of State Commissioners and the Secretaries of Agriculture could scarcely wait to express their approval. In many states these officials depend for reelection on the system of state fertilizer inspectors who live off the taxes exacted from fertilizer "mixers" and dealers. They are the Farm Bureau's friends in the powerful Southern region, Ed O'Neal's cronies dating back to the time when he helped line these officials up for the Republican high-tariff proposals of the twenties, before he was a national Farm Bureau figure. A good many people around Washington believe that the new Food Administrator, Chester Davis, understands what the shooting is all about on this issue and predict that he will act speedily and correctly to adjust it. If he does not, it will amount to weighty evidence on the side of those who contend that Davis will never go against the Farm Bureau in any important matter.

The fertilizer-trust-minded men, even in the Department of Agriculture, are blocking increased food production by refusing to accept the incontrovertible findings of the TVA phosphate experiments and put them into effect throughout the county. Maybe it's timidity; maybe it is something worse. But we had better concern ourselves with the actual food situation, with deficiencies of production, whatever the reasons are. Some economists have contended that there is actually a "surplus" of phosphate capacity. Perhaps the easiest way to judge that is by asking whether or not there is still room for improvement in the rate of food production in the United States. If we dare look at possible world food requirements in the months immediately following the order to cease firing, the necessity of Senator Hill's three-point program, outlined above, becomes even clearer. Only a short time ago there were men who said that we had a "surplus" of power, of aluminum and steel. We must not allow their counterparts to sidetrack us now. One way we can increase our land power is by making the most effective use of every pound of P_2O_5 to produce the greatest amount of food for war uses with the smallest amount of manpower and machinery. One way is to restore this fighting mineral to a fighting soil.

Washington HELEN FULLER

Lyric

At the bottom of the sea
Fish move and hunt and pair,
We move about on the floor
Of a sea of air;
Just as strange the sun-warm bird
As the fish of icy stare,
Just as strange the trees and fronds
Of here as those of there.

On days like these when dripping fruit
Hangs from the hueless autumn trees
The eye dilates like that of trout,
Flesh bears fin memories,
One moves as lost as ship through fog,
The mist about one's knees.
Good the gold pane of distant house,
The tavern by the pier,
Familiar face or voice upon
The shoreless sea of fear.

TOM BOGGS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy on the Eve

WHETHER OR NOT the Allies seek to invade Europe through Italy, the Italian Fascist hierarchy has been seeking to invade the Allies themselves. Just as the Italian people were war-weary even before the war started, so their Fascist leaders may be preparing to come to terms with the Allies even before the invasion of Europe begins. This does not mean that the Fascists will not defend Italy; it merely means that the Fascists have discovered that two can play at the game of appeasement as well as one.

This is a slow and subtle process—secret diplomacy by hints rather than by conferences: a matter of guarded invitations in stray Fascist journals; curious declarations by high churchmen, and above all an obvious wavering of the Axis line in Italy. It means that in their own minds, at least, some Fascist chieftains have given up any hope that the Axis may win the war, and that they are prepared to give up their country after some fight, and to get it back, at a price, in an arrangement of expediency that will put the North African deal with Darlan into the shade.

The impending policy now hinted at in the Fascist press amounts to the following: another attempt to persuade the Anglo-American tories that while fascism is Fascist, it is, after all, not Nazism; an attempt to wed the people more closely to the hopelessly discredited Savoy monarchy; and an attempt to identify fascism—or at least Italy—with "European" and "Christian" ideals which the democracies presumably share.

There is, in short, a new Italian line, not too open, or eager to be recognized, and yet anxious to please. It begins with the usual Axis slogans, but it ends curiously; still prodding the home front, it speaks a different language to foreign listeners.

In an effort to vie in publicity with the Casablanca meeting, the Axis press, unhampered by any thought of geographic accuracy, has christened the early April conference of Hitler and Mussolini "the Salzburg meeting." In the words of the Berlin radio, the happy reunion of the two dictators in a Mozartian atmosphere has brought to Italy " a sharp conversion to total war." Actually, however, the efforts of the Fascist propagandists to inflame the Duce's subjects with a win-or-die spirit sound somewhat frantic and may come too late. Hitherto the Fascist party has been merely a kind of political insurance company for Italians (if you took out a card you were safe—reasonably); but its newly appointed Secretary, Scorza, and the extremist Farinacci would like it now to rise overnight to the militancy of an army of last-ditch fighters. According to Farinacci, party membership should be renewed only to "fanatics." But the Italians are not fools; should many of them fight, they would do so not under the spell of Fascist oratory but out of a distorted sense of military pride—or sheer despair. Anti-Fascist resistance cannot be discussed here; one thing, however, may be said, since even the scant news we have of their activity makes it clear. Resistance in Italy is no longer merely clandestine. Disobedience, occasional sabotage and even strikes have become chronic, so much so as to deserve a more accurate and inspiring name than "underground" work.

Meanwhile, much of the energy of Fascist propaganda has gone into a new and bitter campaign against the black market. The authorities, however, seem to feel rather helpless, for the editor of Ciano's newspaper (Il Telegrafo), Giovanni Ansaldo, the only leading Fascist spokesman who was once in the anti-Fascist ranks, made it clear that the public was to take the fight into its own hands. At the same time Il Telegrafo for April 7 printed the proposal of one reader that "terror squads" be allowed to search every private home, "with the houses of the Duce and the King the only exceptions."

Appealing to the Italian people and threatening them in the same breath, these proclamations have clearly been too panicky to arouse a militant spirit in the people. But the Fascist propaganda line has been clever in exposing Anglo-American "imperialism," and no doubt has been effective. Venezuela has been lumped together with Iran as a typical occupied country, dominated and plundered by American or British forces. Italian transport workers, "somewhere in Africa," have allegedly been compelled by the British "to sign a written renunciation of the welfare benefits granted them under Italian law." The Anglo-American plutocrats can never win, of course, but should they conquer, their victory is condemned in advance as a reactionary one, for it will set back the clock of Fascist "reformism" and condemn mankind to global exploitation.

On the other hand, the new Fascist line is readily apparent in the propaganda intended for, if not actually addressed to, foreign ears. The new Hitler slogan is that Germany intends "the defense of the small states" (a theme evidently intoned at Salzburg); but Mussolini's propagandists are playing their own variations on it. Significantly enough, Il Duce's attitude toward the occupied and neutral countries is defined by his spokesmen as "the conciliatory policy." Its aim, as outlined by Ansaldo, is "national existence and autonomy for the small states," while Virginio Gayda takes pains to prove that all nations will have equal access to the world's natural resources (now a mockery under the gold-standard system of the plutodemocracies), under a Fascist barter-economy. Farinacci cries that fascism fights "not for itself, but to bring justice to all peoples,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Ciano's weekly, Relazioni Internazionali (April 20), proclaims that "the age of national imperialism is over."

If this were all, there would be little to which Hitler could object, unless it were to Mussolini's self-appointment as the "Protector" of the lesser nations. But there is more to it. Critica Fascista (April 15), the official bi-weekly of the Fascist brain-trust, led the way with a superficially puzzling article by a former Minister (and the official "liberal" of the party), Giuseppe Bottai. All the warring nations, he asserts, are already "more or less authoritarian," since they have all adopted a state-controlled economy; and he complains that the "democracies are trying to steal all our ideas." Indeed, the Anglo-American plans for Europe come only to a bad imitation of "our new order." Why then, he seems finally to suggest, don't the Allies let us do the job of totalitarianizing Europe ourselves? He tacitly admits that Hitler's own conception of "the new Europe" is uncompromising and rather too rigid; but it appears that Italian fascism is happily more flexible—and civilized. Nor do Bottai and his friends make a secret of what the Italian version of the "new order" would be. It is "Christian" (read Clerical) fascism.

The Church has not been shy in proclaiming its usefulness, and once more the Fascists seem willing to admit it. Thus a Catholic newspaper of Bologna, L'Avvenire d'Italia (April 7), after paying lip-service to the "victory-or nothing" order of the day, is allowed by the Fascist censorship to suggest that the Pope's peace-feelers should not be discounted, and to wonder: "Is it true that only force has a constructive value in bringing about peace?"

As late as the end of March, the Fascist press and radio were still attacking the Vatican organ, the Osservatore Romano, for its support of an ultra-conservative social-reformism *à la* Leo XIII in the post-war period. "The Italian people," those Fascists protested, "have no need of spectacular innovations" (*sic*). But a few days later, there was a sudden change. Mussolini's own newspaper, Il Popolo d'Italia, opened its columns to Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop of Milan, for a declaration of principles on post-war Italy.

The prelate's address opened with the startling admission that anti-clericalism is spreading in Italy under the Concordat, that some are indulging "in profanations of the Eucharist" and that there are even "organizations to promote blasphemy." Then the Cardinal went on to more secular matters: "As to the talk in our press about plans for European reconstruction [obviously Hitler's peace aims], it is our paternal duty to tell our beloved children quite clearly that Italy has so rich a tradition that she can teach civilization to any other nation, and has no need to borrow new social forms from any country." Those who might have found his repudiation of Nazism unclear were then reminded that "the Italian people have always been one with Latin civilization, which has been united with Christianity for more than seventeen centuries, and has found in Catholicism its divine support." His Eminence, whom the Italians often call "the Fascist Cardinal," didn't find it prudent at this time to mention fascism directly; he wisely preferred to pay homage to the King and left a warning to his subjects: "Let the Italians remember that the Monarchy of Savoy is the guarantee of national unity." The Cardinal's peroration also paid homage to no less a man than Justinian, "who wanted his imperial legislation to be inspired by the Holy Gospel"; the peace-makers of the future, he concluded, should simply follow his example.

Nor is this all. It is significant, for instance, that the Fascist press and radio seem to be slowly dropping the anti-Semitic line. Thus Fascist "kindness" to Jews in Southern France, as reported recently in The New York Times, appears to have been part of the new policy. Francesco Orestano, a well known if highly disreputable figure in academic circles in Rome, has dared to write in Critica Fascista that "the National-Socialist attitude toward Christianity is inacceptable," and elsewhere that "Europe, in this fateful moment, being one with the Christian idea, cannot countenance the racial theory"!

Now whom are these Fascist propagandists addressing? Is it Europe's small nations, in an effort to persuade them that they are in the same boat with the Italians, if not with the Nazis? Or aren't they rather aiming at the Foreign Offices of the democracies, in an effort once more to appear as the "good Fascists" whom the world knew before 1940?

The meaning of all these symptoms should not, of course, be exaggerated. Never, indeed, has the Italian situation been so fluid—that is, less predictable. And yet one may remember that in one week, not very long ago, the Fascist chieftains (with the possible exception of that "one man and one man alone") were simultaneously courted by Herr von Ribbentrop and Archbishop Spellman. There are also well founded suspicions that the notorious general of the Fascist militia, Bergonzoli (better known as "Electric Whiskers"), who was captured by the British in Libya and then turned up successively in Washington as a guest of the State Department and in Madrid as an ambassador of American good will to General Franco (who, incidentally, owes to him the loss of the battle of Guadalajara), may be now enjoying the spring weather in Rome.

The plans of the Fascist clique (with or without Mussolini) are not a mystery. First they want to wait and be sure that the Anglo-Americans can invade Europe in force. Then, if and when the invasion has made successful headway, they want the Italians to die by the thousands—so as to enhance their own bargaining power. At such a moment a Darlanian deal for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy could be happily consummated with the blessing of scores of cardinals, and the signature of a mummified King, amid the hosannas of Washington Machiavellians. The operation should be extremely painless to all except the Italian people themselves—who would probably then be ready for a desperate civil war. At that time, their political education would presumably be complete. American democracy would then have been their last illusion. The last myth on which millions had built their hopes would then appear identical in their eyes with a self-perpetuating Fascist tyranny.

PAOLO MILANO

Congress on the Loose

EVERY MEMBER of the Seventy-eighth Congress will solemnly declare that he is supporting the war effort 100 percent. He has voted enormous sums for the army, the navy and the air force. He has made speeches in praise of MacArthur and other war heroes; he has attacked bureaucratic inefficiency and red tape that hinder the war effort.

Reading The Congressional Record, one begins to wonder. Why so much talk about bureaucracy, so many complaints and attacks on those entrusted with the complex jobs incident to keeping our home economy in balance and our armed forces in action? There is nothing constructively helpful in these attacks. Why make them? Gradually the answer becomes clear.

Congress is not giving all of its time to the war effort. The campaigns being fought at such tragic cost in the Pacific and in North Africa are not the only campaigns Congress is thinking about. For it has its collective mind on another campaign—that to be fought on the hustings before the American public in 1944.

Nearly all the Republicans and a lot of Democrats in Congress are possessed by a fear which haunts them, destroys their sleep, upsets their digestion and renders them incapable of reasoned thought. The fourth term. It overshadows everything, it determines present policy and makes impossible any wise planning for the future.

How can we prevent the fourth term? That is the question. The answer is by a concerted drive to promote distrust of the administration. Attack bureaucracy; play up mistakes and delays; charge New Deal agencies with being socialistic and subversive; take direct action against so-called radicals and communists on government pay rolls. Thus convince the people that the Roosevelt administration is wasteful and inefficient and is motivated by utopian and even subversive ideals.

Undermine public confidence in the conduct of the war. Charge that the President's attitude toward labor is preventing full production of planes and tanks and ships. Play on the public's deep concern over the war in the Pacific. Why don't we send more planes to MacArthur, more aid to China? Why didn't we fight the Japs to a finish before opening the North African front? Why help Britain and neglect China?

Pound away on all this. The press and the radio will repeat every charge made; prejudiced columnists will enlarge on them and well paid commentators will dramatize them on the radio. The people are confused and annoyed by rationing and taxes and the uncertainties about manpower and the draft. Convince them that the administration is responsible because it doesn't have the "know how."

All this is being done, consistently and advisedly. At the same time the public is solemnly assured that Congress is backing the Commander-in-Chief to the limit; that only on domestic issues is there any opposition. This is not true but it sounds well.

The campaign against the President involves a lot more than speech-making. It includes covert or open opposition to every administration measure, except only direct appropriations for the army and navy.

Clever strategy is used. When certain legislation cannot be prevented, destructive amendments are offered, even on measures of paramount importance to the war effort. An excellent example is the amendment to Lend-Lease offered by Representative Vorys of Ohio on March 10. It provided that all agreements under Lend-Lease must have the approval of both houses of Congress. This would hamstring the administration and vitally cripple or stop Lend-Lease. On the teller vote there were 118 ayes and 178 nays. Republicans were responsible for nearly all of the aye votes. (Even the most reactionary Democrats support the President's foreign policy and the war.) With the Vorys amendment rejected, the record vote on the bill was taken. On this recorded vote only six had the courage to vote against the bill. The others can go home and solemnly declare that they voted for Lend-Lease.

Another example: When voting to renew for two years the Treasury's stabilization fund, both House and Senate put an end to the President's dollar-devaluation authority and by committee amendment made illegal the use of any part of this money as part of a proposed post-war fund for stabilizing world currencies. Enough such amendments can result in tying the hands of the President in every relation with foreign nations.

The same tactics may be tried on the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements. The isolationists are determined either to tack on an amendment requiring congressional ratification of each such agreement or to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go along with Senate Republican Leader McNary in his demand that Congress be authorized to nullify within sixty days by a majority vote any agreement made. On this the Democratic majority can probably be depended upon to hold the line.

Every appropriation bill gives the experts splendid chances at what may be called skulduggery. The bill itself can withhold an appropriation for an unpopular agency; or a watchful member can offer an amendment carrying the death sentence for an agency or for an employee suspected of being "unfit."

Examples are numerous. One is the House scuttling of the Farm Security Administration; a neat job done by Chairman Clarence Cannon and the other aides of Farm Bureau lobbyist Ed O'Neal. No mention of the FSA was made in the bill. Hence the provision transferring its work to the Farm Credit Administration and the Extension Service was not subject to a point of order; it was an innocent appropriation and was NOT legislation on an appropriation bill.

February 17, 1943, was a red-letter day for this same Chairman Cannon. For on that day the National Resources Planning Board was cleverly abolished by the simple device of omitting any reference to it in the independent-offices bill. When Representative Magnuson offered an amendment for its continuance, his amendment was swept aside on a point of order made by Dirksen. Taber of New York thereupon said: "The work of the board has been useless and it has been a menace to the country." In fact, all planning is a menace.

Then blithely the House moved on to the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Its sin has been to save too many homes, partly by reducing the interest rate and the costs of refinancing. The able lobbyist who engineered this was Morton Bodfish. The able legislator who fathered the successful amendment was the astute Dirksen. Opponents of the amendment think that the banks and private loan companies will be given the sound loans and the government will take the losses.

On the roll call demanded on this Dirksen amendment not one Republican voted with the 157 Democrats who opposed this steal. With 37 Democrats joining 187 Republicans, the deal was consummated.

Another example of what an appropriation bill can accomplish is the Pickens job. Mr. Pickens, as everybody knows, is a Negro graduate of Yale who is employed in the Treasury Department. He was charged with having been a member of all sorts of "subversive" organizations. On February 5 Rep. Joe Hendricks of Florida presented an amendment to the current appropriation bill providing that "no part of any appropriation" in the act be used to pay the salary of William Pickens. Just that and nothing more. Punishment without due process of law. In a teller vote the amendment was accepted by 163 to 111.

At once charges of race discrimination were made by Negro leaders all over the land. This was dynamite. Even those representatives who fervently desired to remove William Pickens and all others accused of subversive ideas, had to pause. Thought must be given to the consequences. That fourth term might be achieved if the Democratic Party held the Negro vote; it might be prevented if the Republican Party could win back that vote, lost in 1932. The issue became clear. There was a great scurrying about among the politicians on Capitol Hill. On February 9 a record vote was called for on the Hendricks amendment. Joe Martin and John McCormack both spoke against the amendment. It was voted down: 136 yeas to 267 nays. Ironically, among those voting "nay" were members who have made a reputation by attacking radicals. But this case was too hot.

Another method used to put over legislation opposed by the administration is for one committee to pirate the jurisdiction of another. This is why anti-labor legislation pops up in one committee after another having no jurisdiction. Chairmen Carl Vinson of the Naval Affairs Commitee, Hatton W. Sumners of the unjudicial Judiciary Committee and Andrew Jackson May of the Military Affairs Committee are all out in front in this breaking down of legislative ethics. Of course the Labor Committee rightly contends that all labor bills should come from itself. Reps. Howard Smith and Sam Hobbs get their anti-labor bills reported out by the Judiciary Committee; Clare E. Hoffman and Francis E. Walter, among others, have tried this method.

When a strike is threatened, when absenteeism is presented as a menace to war production, when any charges are made against organized labor, all the patriots rush to arms. Now is the time, in the guise of aiding war production, to pass the laws that labor has always opposed. Get them firmly on the statute books and hope for a long period of conservatism to keep them there. Wave the flag and drive labor to ground. Since the Labor Committee refuses to vote out shotgun legislation, the slick thing to do is to prostitute other commitees to that end.

All of the legislators who try to destroy good bills by bad amendments, who abolish essential agencies favored by the President, who wantonly disregard the rights of labor and the Labor Committee, will declare in all sincerity: "We are supporting the war; we ARE supporting the Commander-in-Chief. If our opposition to New Deal agencies and to the President's domestic policies convinces Hitler and Mussolini and Hirohito that Roosevelt does not have the support of Congress, that is regrettable. But we must assert the rights of Congress and must destroy bureaucracy." They do not mention the fourth term. They will later!

POTOMACUS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The Anti-Inflation Subsidies

THIS HAS BEEN a good week in Tunis and a bad week at home. John L. Lewis, who doesn't care for the war, is heading his army of miners towards what looks like a blow-up, and Congress is in an ugly mood. The effect, almost certainly, is going to be repressive labor legislation now, and making the boys in the trenches hate a bushy-browed labor bogey that will last God knows how many years. Again, Mr. Lewis doesn't care. He is a bitter man. He will feed on bitterness.

The screw slowly turning on America's war nerves has had one unexpected result. Anybody could see that sooner or later the inflationary cost-of-living spiral would come to a crisis, and that the mounting dissatisfaction of labor over food costs and recent restrictions would also come to a head. Well, both reached a climax this week—the week of Tunisian victory. The War Labor Board told Byrnes unanimously that the April 8 "hold the line" wage order is unworkable and will have to be modified. This is the order which says that worker A earning 25 cents an hour at a factory on one side of the street, has no redress if worker B, on the other side of the street, gets 50 cents for doing exactly the same thing. Heretofore the WLB has been empowered to adjust such inequities. Now it can't. The April 8 order wiped out its discretion and gave Lewis a handle for appealing to the discontent not only of his own workers but of all labor.

One immediate thing these two events accomplished: they brought out into the open the subject of anti-inflation price subsidies. The administration finally took matters into its own hands and proceeded on a course that will infuriate the farm bloc. It proposes to roll back prices on meats, butter and certain other goods, by 10 percent, and do it by subsidies. The thing to remember here is that this is an open defiance of Congress and particularly of the farm bloc. Under cover of the coal threat the administration is putting over something just as bold as the destroyer deal.

Every respectable economist has argued that to curb inflation at least two more steps were needed: congressional enactment of more taxes, like the $16,000,000,000 Mr. Roosevelt has asked for (and not got), and subsidies, like those in Britain and Canada, to meet the spread between wholesale and retail prices. Both these steps have been urgd by administration spokesmen. Both of them have been held up, thus far, by Congress.

Leon Henderson first proposed a billion or more dollars for subsidies. Congress almost fainted. Yet Britain and Canada are using subsidies and they work; Britain at the rate of $600,000,000 annually. Recently Walter Lippmann threw his column into the fray. Some of us felt he was unfair in denouncing the administration for failing to obtain subsidies. Faithful government servants have sacrificed their political lives in the past two years, trying to get this system approved by Congress, while Mr. Lippmann never batted an eyelash. But now the connection between labor unrest and increasing prices is so obvious and urgent that there is a good chance that the British system, already applied to coal and oil, will be extended to foods. Mr. Roosevelt's step is a constitutional short-cut, like the destroyer deal, taken in defiance of the farm bloc, which is apt to scream with rage. But if American history teaches anything it is that if Congress won't move in a crisis the executive will. Most of the much-criticized administration power today is due to the inability of Congress to act for itself.

The past week has been enlivened by the testimony of John Monroe, formerly Kaplan, manufacturers' agent, who opened a "big red house on R Street." Few incidents cast more light on wartime Washington. No graft or corruption has yet come to light; it is just that in times like these people like Monroe move in on the Capital, and when somebody turns over a log, there they are. By day Monroe sought war contracts, and by night he entertained lavishly, impressing his naïve out-of-town clients with celebrities. Many business men who have built up their own synthetic nightmare of Washington, and hate and fear the place, want to put their hand into that of some confident, self-assured guide when they come here. That is where Monroe-Kaplan fitted in. In capturing celebrities for his parties, including Archduke Otto and Secretary Knox, he would never take "no" for an answer. He was brassy as a dinner gong. Invitations to prominent people were baited with invitations to meet prominent people. When Knox came to meet Senator Bridges, Bridges wasn't there—but other guests were, to meet Knox. It was a vicious circle. Food was good.

We got to wondering about Monroe and wedged our way into the hearing room to look at him. We have never seen a session so jammed. A path miraculously opened before us, however, behind a pretty blonde, who turned out to be Clare Luce. The vacuum behind her sucked us right up to the congressional table, where we stood, watching over Miss Luce's shoulder as she drew caricatures of Monroe, in ink. She is good at this sort of thing and could certainly earn $45 a week on any of the better journals.

Monroe is one of those super-slick men who always dig their own pitfalls. Thus, in his initial inquiry, he might have caused hardly a ripple if he had not refused to answer a simple question about some of his R Street guests, on the ground that it would tend to incriminate him. That made a mystery of the thing, and he was ruined in a second.

Now he was being effusively frank. He had an exaggerated air of good fellowship and was working a Southern accent for all it was worth, with New Jersey overtones. He kept telling how patriotic he was, and even some of the congressmen blushed. He was nattily dressed, with prize-fighter build, and he kept reminding us of somebody. Finally we figured it out: Huey Long.

All we could think of after a while was of a big fish, firmly hooked and held up for everyone to see, with all its fins and gills going. Yes, this was a stocky fish, in a blue suit, jerked out of a muddy pool and only wanting to get back to its ooze again. We got tired after a while. We hoped they would throw it back. Watching its struggle was a bit obscene.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jus Divinum

Sons and Soldiers, by Irwin Shaw. Morosco Theatre, May 4, 1943.

THIS NEW PLAY at the Morosco is one of those pieces which several persons must have thought well of and which many would wish well. It tries a serious theme and one capable of wide and profound application to the war and to the continuous line of our human life. From the breast of woman flows this life, to be given through her sons to the great causes, the fighting, the courage, the loving of some woman to madness, the repetition and perpetuation of the race, the music, the poems, the pain and happiness, the destiny of man.

The story of "Sons and Soldiers" is of a woman who has been told by the family doctor that she will die if she lets her child be born. She finally declares that she will not go to the hospital, that she will have her son and his name shall be Andrew. As things turn out, she has two sons, Andrew and Ernest. Ernest goes off to the war and is killed, Andrew marries and is leaving for the war. Nothing is regretted, and the last scene is composed largely of the reasons why life after all is to be lived and loved, whatever the cost, for there is the glory, the fulfilment and the benediction, the winning of the pros and cons, in sum.

All that is to the good, and Mr. Irwin Shaw has taken prizes and won his honorable mention in the past, and he wrote this play. Mr. Max Reinhardt is, or has been, an almost omnipresent producer, carefully maintained and promoted in the public view, and with some eminently conspicuous productions and some excellent early productions to his credit and good artists in every field brought together by his assembling hand. (My opinion is that Mr. Reinhardt has always known far better than have his critics as to when he was distinguished and when he was not.) Mr. Norman Bel Geddes I should say is one of the two or three genuises—using the word carefully—that our theatre has ever produced. Everybody by now must know the abundance, ingenuity and vitality of his creative invention, his versatility and his audacity of design—much of his approach is in the nature of raids into the country of design. And Miss Geraldine Fitzgerald has gone so far as to desert Hollywood for this role of hers in "Sons and Soldiers."

It would look, then, as if all these four had thought the play of some significance, or possible splendor, in the theatre. Well, such things are among the mysteries of the theatre. Did not one of these at least see, even if but gradually, what the result was going to be and see that fact before the play got as far as a Broadway presentation? Doubtless, yes. But you have to know the theatre to know how the current carries all along with it, and how almost impossible it is to make any difference in the course of a production's history. At any rate what happens in "Sons and Soldiers," as we get it, is a muddle and mess, and entirely without any claims to theatre cogency, structural line or importance of style. It has not even any true bounce or joy or merry rout to it. It has, to vary the verse, a burning forehead but a parching tongue. Its variety, or attempt at variety, such as the college scene, the park scene, the birthday-party scene, the off-to-war scene and the scenelike-scene, is not variety but only a snappy monotony after all. And the speeches, especially in the last act, where the son Andrew explains why he is not sorry his mother let him be born, are unfortunately banal and self-conscious, as if the dramatist were nervous that there should be an attempt of one human spirit to express and explain itself to another.

On that last point the question arises as to why our drama has such a time of it when something of import is to be expressed. Is it our famous Anglo-Saxon reserve about which we have so often reminded foreigners that they half believe it? Is it the dearth of conversation in America that foreigners constantly complain of? The implications and comments with regard to that subject are too complex to be gone into here. In the modern British drama as a rule the expression of the serious is jumpy and silly—the height of which is Mr. Noel Coward's idea of a love scene: as when, for example, the modern equivalent of Cleopatra says to Anthony's modern equivalent, "I want you terribly," which is to be taken as violent desire withheld but which is about as reserved and as vulgar as a list for the laundry.

At any rate, Mr. Reinhardt has directed "Sons and Soldiers" with a certain hollow efficiency, giving every player his chance and every scene its aroma. Mr. Geddes has designed a room with genuine architectural authority and not undramatic. Miss Fitzgerald gives a good performance, which, I think, if left to herself, she could give a further depth to. In the cast otherwise there is Mr. Gregory Peck, who has a genuine stage quality and makes his role a good deal better than the writing of it is. STARK YOUNG

Let Us Now Praise Movies

IN "THE OXBOW INCIDENT," which is not a horse opera, a dreadful side of human beings is portrayed in a magnificent film. It marks a break in Hollywood's ugly movie career because the people behind it—William Wellman, Lamar Trotti, Walter Van Tilburg Clark—director, producer and writer—and Henry Fonda, Frank Conroy and Henry Morgan, the players, had their say without losing a scene, a character or a line of dialogue to the Hays Office, the studio or the box office. As the work of unhampered artists, it is for the audience a thrilling experience.

The movie is an examination of an incident—the lynching of three men at The Oxbow, Nevada, in 1885. Aside from its extraordinary indictment of lynching, it shows the failure of liberal men, inspired by justice, when they are opposed by irrational and powerful men of anger. The men of the town, and one woman, were led willingly toward the hanging by an ex-soldier, Colonel Tetley, who dressed his fanaticism in his old Civil War uniform for the occasion, and brought the thing off with the aplomb of a born leader. The few who rebelled against the hanging were too weak to oppose this man's will, or too scared for their own skins—this includes the hero. The leader who fought for justice could not find the emotional key to the situation and lost every trick to Tetley for that reason.

But its soundest, most original declaration is its realistic, pedestrian view of violence, that there is nothing unusual about it in our society, that the men who participated in it did not regard it as violence. The main reason offered by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the movie for the success of the lynching is that the majority of the people were either irresponsible, ignorant or moronic, the lynching a form of self-esteem, and a natural product of such characters as the film had already built. There was no hysteria. Several hours elapsed between the decision and the fulfilment, the victims were allowed to plead their case, write last letters and share a meal with their hangmen.

The introduction to this situation is an example of perfection in movie techniques of camera work and acting. Free for once to play into the character without being pushed around by unlikelihoods, Henry Fonda is magnificent in his projection of an unremarkable, bored, sexually frustrated cowboy, who has been on the range too long, analyzing a nude painting over the saloon mirror, getting drunk fast and beating someone half to death just out of meanness. Alongside, his buddy, Henry Morgan, creates an insensitive, moronic cowboy by a masterpiece of restrained playing.

The camera pace is slow, monosyllabic and stolid, it drills persistently into the scene, seeing the event as less important than the behavior of the people making it. Its violence is blunt and dreadful, its details beautiful to watch —details such as the exchange of smiles between the tyrannized and sickly, appalled son of Colonel Tetley and the Mexican he is forced into helping to lynch, or the scene at the end between the Colonel and his son, with the laugh which the son wrenches out of a hysterical sob. More than anything I would like to emphasize the psychological tension built out of visual movement, which is the movies' own baby. It is overpowering in such scenes as that of the Negro preacher walking toward the hostile crowd, the pace so felt that the air into which the man walks seems to be pressing him back. I tell you this is a movie.

On its way "The Oxbow Incident" destroys all kinds of puritanisms that have been strangling movies for years. The ex-soldier makes his sadism respectable by a uniform which personifies justice; a housewife—moreover, that cliché of Mother Earth, Jane "Ma" Darwell—is shown as the most extreme sadist of the crowd, and lewd in the bargain; a son is shown in wild joy when his father commits suicide; the hero is actually no hero; the Negro is treated as a human character not a side-show freak, his religion a detached mysticism. The idea it implants that the Mexican is the only man on a grand scale among the just and the unjust is the most surprising departure of all —unless it might be the fact that none of these points is hammered at you *à la* Carry Nation.

The movie is so fine that its faults are on an astonishingly high level. It chose to accent the nobility of the victims, in preference to depicting the individual reactions of the murderers. But the nobility of the lynched men is actually of no consequence so far as the morality of lynching is concerned. The main impact is frittered away in an ending which shouldn't have happened, since the audience has already felt the guilt of the deed: everything after the revelation of the men's innocence is merely slugging away at empty air; the opponent has already gone down.

It is an American legend that Hollywood cannot produce a serious work of art because of censorship, the role of the movies as the entertainer of the masses and the synthetic, mechanical quality of the medium, which esthetes say makes it incapable of personal expression. For the good of everyone, that legend can now be called extinct. "The Oxbow Incident" is a significant moment in our culture. Cheer for it and hope it will not stand alone.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

Public resentment at nearby Marengo over importation of young Japanese Americans to work as truck farmers under a federal relocation plan resulted last night in a decision by Otto Schnering, president of the Curtiss Candy Company, which operates the farms, to cancel the plan.

"Our townspeople believe in justice as much as anybody, but they just don't like the idea of these strangers being around," [Chief of Police] Carr said. – *From The Chicago Sun.*

"[Harold] Rugg," said Wheaton M. Brewer, as chairman of a special committee of the Pacific Advertising Association, "undermines an American's confidence in his business affairs. He teaches that jobbers and wholesalers are parasites. He disparages our way of doing business.

"He suggests group action—a far cry from the tenets of original American liberty."

Brewer took the view that teachers, with "little conception" of the outside world, needed the help of representatives from business, labor and higher institutions to help them select textbooks. – *From The San Francisco Chronicle.*

He also found that there had been regular intimacies between men prisoners and those in the women's section. When the women wanted company, all they had to do was ask for an electrician or a plumber, and it seems that most of the prisoners were either electricians or plumbers. – *A news story in The Atlanta Journal regarding conditions at the state prison in Tattnall County, Georgia.*

"Due Process," Southern Style

"I [Sheriff Reddock of Jones County, Mississippi] refused to tell Holder to give up the keys," he added. "They could not get in the steel door, for it was locked on the inside. I pleaded with the mob. I told them they should think of their children. Also I said if this terrible thing happens I'll lose my job. They said 'If you lose it we'll get you another.' "

. . . Identifying Jones as one of the crowd, Reddock testified:

"He came up to me and said, 'Why don't you turn over the keys? All our family voted for you, so let me have the keys.' " – *From the New York Times account of the trial at Hattiesburg, Mississippi, of the lynchers of Howard Wash.*

That All-Out Effort

The restricted numbers [banned at the Atlantic City post of the Army Air Forces] include "Roll Out the Barrel," "When the War Is Over," "Around Her Neck," "Oh, My Feet Hurt," "I've Been Working on the Railroad," "The Moron Song," "How Dry I Am" and "Parlez-Vous." The songs, it was said, might be interpreted as slurs on women, the courage of soldiers or as drinking songs. – *From The New York Times.*

Total-War Department

The Berlin radio charged today that American fliers become proficient at "terror raids" by shooting up Brooklyn. . . . They evidently referred to discharge of an anti-aircraft gun following Sunday's practice air-raid alert here. – *A UP dispatch in PM.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Prince Loewenstein on Germany

SIR: While in Germany a common front of religion and labor is forming against Nazism, while sabotage is mounting and students in Munich and Berlin pay with their lives for underground activities, while, finally, Hitler has had to increase his blackshirted army of occupation against the German people to fifty divisions, the Vansittart school of thought has invaded the United States. Its promoters are self-seeking monarchist agents, German Quislings, political snobs and reactionaries of all shades and nationalities. They all seem to think that the soldiers of the United Nations as well as Spanish, German and Italian antifascists are shedding their blood for a European "order" compared with which the Vienna Congress would look like an instrument of progressive radicalism.

The idea behind these intrigues is only too obvious. It is, to sterilize the democratic will of the peoples, and to draw a *cordon sanitaire* around any nation or group to which the outlived forms of yesterday are no longer acceptable. The Prussian shibboleth serves to dodge the social problem, which is at the bottom of the pre-war conspiracy against the peoples, and to whitewash international fascism of its blood guilt.

Apparently a new colonial period is being planned, with the Europeans as the "backward nations." Only recently have we heard of semi-official plans to dismantle most of German industry and put the rest under foreign control. We may rest assured that such control would not be confined to German industry. Under the euphemistic term of "federalizing Germany," these plans envisage the atomization of Central Europe into petty eighteenth-century "autonomous" states easily controllable by foreign *Gauleiters*. Already a "Bavarian National Committee" has been formed in New York City. Surely, I could get support for the sovereign rights of Loewenstein, if I just tried! . . .

Such a policy is apt to undermine the confidence of the oppressed in American democratic integrity. It is playing Hitler's game and prolongs the war. Should it ever be put into practice, this "new order" would require the constant use of bayonets by which it would have to be created. It would inevitably lead to the Third World War within a generation.

I can visualize future Germany only within a commonwealth of European nations, socially and politically free. This commonwealth, endowed with central executive, legislative and judiciary organs, should be linked to the Russian, British, American and all other peoples with bonds of closest friendship.

The European commonwealth should regard its nations as natural units. No national territory must be divided. Particularly the German working class looks upon the integrity of the German soil as a prerequisite of progressive social democracy. In border provinces, like Austria, free plebiscites should establish the true will of the population, while remaining minorities must receive international protection.

A thorough land reform will destroy the economic power of the Junker class and create a strong peasantry peaceful by its very nature. Also, I would transfer control over all means of production to the people itself, to managers, workers and consumers. This would take care of the German partners in the game of international fascism—let us hope that the other nations will deal with the non-German partners appropriately. An international council of social and economic planning, assisted by national councils, should have control over all essential exports and imports—a further guarantee against secret rearmament and war. Federal-European control over all national armed forces would be advisable.

In Germany, a special police force recruited from among the German inmates of Nazi concentration camps should be at the disposal of the government of the second republic. Implacable courts of justice will bring all Nazi criminals to trial. Similar measures, it is to be hoped, will be taken by the other nations with regard to their native fascists of whatever guise.

The German educational system should be closely linked with a future system of international schools and universities. To impose foreign educators on Germany would lead to pitiful failure.

A beginning should be made now by offering, instead of annihilation, partnership in the United Nations to the millions and millions in Germany, Catholics, Protestants, liberals and radicals, who have been struggling against Hitler while the tories still flirted with him.

As a German anti-fascist who has actively opposed totalitarianism ever since his student days, I feel that this war and the ensuing peace can be won only by the peoples and for the peoples. The neo-fascism which today develops before our eyes would transform the war into a permanent world institution.

Newfoundland, N. J. PRINCE HUBERTUS ZU LOEWENSTEIN

The Atlanta Race Conference

SIR: In The New Republic of April 19 you use some pretty rough language with regard to a statement adopted at a conference in Atlanta on Race Relations by a group of White Southerners.

As one of the signers of the document, I think your readers are entitled to see the section dealing with present arrangements of segregation and make up their own minds whether or not it is an unfair or unrealistic approach to this problem:

> The race problem in any Southern community is complicated by our economic limitations. The factors which have kept the South a tributary section have also kept it poor and lacking in sufficient industry to develop and to provide enough jobs and enough public funds for every public need. Yet the only justification offered for those laws which have for their purpose the separation of the races is that they are intended to minister to the welfare and integrity of both races. There has been widespread and inexcusable discrimination in the administration of these laws. The white Southerner has an obligation to interest himself in the legitimate aspirations of the Negro. This means correcting the discrimination between the races in the allocation of school funds; in the number and quality of schools, and in the salaries of teachers. In public travel, where the law demands a separation of the races, primary justice and a simple sense of fair play demand the facilities for safety, comfort and health should be equal. The distribution of public utilities and public benefits, such as sewers, water, housing, street and sidewalk paving, playgrounds, public-health and hospital facilities should come to the Negro upon the basis of population and need.

Atlanta, Ga. FRANK MCCALLISTER

[We realize the race problem is infinitely more complicated in the South than in the North because of the larger proportion of Negroes in the population; however, acknowledging the sincerity and good intent of the white Southerners who met in Atlanta,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the editors can only reiterate their views on segregation. It is a primary and fundamental injustice. It makes possible the flagrant discrimination and abuses which the Atlanta conferees deplore. Separation is a euphemism; for segregation is segregation however a paragraph may be worded. When a man goes to a strange country and finds himself an outcast, it is not because his neighbors are worried about his "welfare and integrity" but because they despise him.—THE EDITORS]

Censorship on the Race Problem

SIR: In connection with my recently published book, "Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race" (Columbia University Press, reviewed in your issue of April 12, 1943), the following may be of interest to you and your readers.

The Columbia University Press recently received an order from the bookstore of the University of Southern California for a copy of this book to be sent to a Japanese man interned at Lordsburg, New Mexico. This week the book was returned to the publishers with the following notation: "These books are returned because they are objectionable to censorship and cannot be forwarded to prisoners of war or civilian internees."

Since the book is a scientific discussion of the data bearing on the "race problem" which completely disposes of Nazi-Fascist race mythology, we are all at an utter loss to understand on what grounds such a book can be found objectionable to censorship. There is a statement in the book that such a work could not be published in the state of Mississippi without incurring a heavy fine and imprisonment, and there is also an appendix listing the thirty states of the Union which have laws on their books against intermarriage between whites and non-whites. Can it be that the censor feared that such facts might cause the Japanese to think that some Americans are not as democratic as they pretend to be? Or may it be that the censoring authorities do not wish to corrupt their Japanese ward's mind with anti-Nazi propaganda?

I am so interested to know what the correct answer is that I am going to attempt to find out.

Philadelphia, Pa. M. F. ASHLEY MONTAGU

The New Zionism

SIR: In your editorial of March 8 on "The New Zionism," you characterized the New Zionist demands as "neither temperate nor wise." The anti-Jewish persecutions are not temperate either, and to check them effectively we must abandon the ghetto "temperance" which for centuries has characterized Jewish policy. . . .

Indeed, our demands are not temperate, but they are *just; and Justice is never temperate. Justice is total, indivisible, militant!* What we demand should be self-evident to every normal person of good will—equality. Every people the world over has the right to combat the forces of evil under its *own* banner. Obviously, we too have that right. Luxemburg and the Philippines have seats among the United Nations. We demand a similar status. Only those who do not recognize equality among the people on God's earth can refuse these just demands. . . .

You yourself admit that even after a Nazi collapse "there will be parts of Europe into which most Jews will prefer not to venture." But these "parts" comprise all of the East and large sections of South and Central Europe, where the overwhelming majority of pre-war Jewry was concentrated. You fear that "the frank recognition of these unpleasant facts will lead us to counsels of despair." We do not fear this. We are prepared to face "unpleasant facts" not with despair but with constructive, far-reaching plans: A Jewish army, Jewish mass repatriation and a Jewish state in Palestine. Thus, we give the suffering Jewish masses an ideal for which to suffer and to fight. . . .

We are proud to state that many hundreds of prominent American Gentiles have already endorsed our "intemperate and unwise" demands. Your editorial charges that "at least some of them must be quite ignorant of the implications of the program they have endorsed." We reject this imputation. . . .

We do not pretend "to speak for all the Jews of Europe if not of the entire world," as your editorial asserts. . . . We speak not "for," but "in the interests of," the Jewish people, as we conceive those interests. There is no need of any "mandate" for this. We represent an *idea.* We offer a *plan.* And we challenge every thinking, independent Jew and Gentile to judge us exclusively from this single point of view: Is the idea a good one and is the plan practicable? If the answer is in the affirmative, then we are entitled to recognition and sympathetic support of our aims and ideals and aspirations. . . .

THE NEW ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
SAMUEL L. KATZ, Member of the Executive Committee
New York City

William James and the Pluriverse

SIR: I am surprised to read Irwin Edman's parenthetical claim that *pluriverse* is William James's "own word" (p. 225 of your number for February 15). Can he give us the authority for such a statement? Some of us have long believed that the originator of this provocative word was Benjamin Paul Blood, of Amsterdam, New York—a picturesque village philosopher, rescued by James from oblivion, and whose volume "Pluriverse," edited by H. M. Kallen, was posthumously published in 1920. William James himself visited Blood in his home town, and later contributed to The Hibbert Journal an essay which awakens in all lovers of indigenous thought regret that so little of *Blood's prose and verse remains accessible to the general reader.*

New York City ROBERT ALLERTON PARKER

SIR: Mr. Parker is, of course, completely correct. I very much regret that my parenthetical phrase was so unintentionally misleading. I should have said: "a word James was fond of using to describe his own philosophy," and I should also have added that the word "pluriverse" was invented by Benjamin Paul Blood. As my phrase was so parenthetical in any case, I neglected to mention that fact, which I now see I should not have done.

New York City IRWIN EDMAN

From The New Republic Mail Bag

From Gordon W. Allport, president of the Eastern Psychological Association, comes a copy of a resolution expressing confidence in the competence and loyalty of Goodwin W. Watson, analyst for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. The resolution charges the Dies Committee with making false accusations against Dr. Watson, and the Kerr Committee with giving him an inadequate hearing. "Be it resolved," reads the resolution, "that we deplore any political persecution of civil servants . . . and that Dr. Watson be given a truly adequate hearing, or that the charges against him be dismissed. . . ."

PFC William Stevens, of the Army Air Corps, writes to us from Australia deploring the disunity among the United Nations. In his opinion isolationist and reactionary groups in our own country are doing more to disrupt coöperation among the United Nations than even the German propagandists. ". . . Before Russia entered the war," writes Private Stevens, "these same people drove a wedge between Great Britain and ourselves. . . . [Now they are driving] a more effective wedge . . . between Russia on one hand and the United States and Great Britain on the other. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Newest Machiavelli

JAMES BURNHAM starts his new book[1] by making a distinction between the formal meaning of political documents and their real or practical meaning. To illustrate the point, he offers an extended analysis of Dante's Latin treatise, "De Monarchia." The formal meaning of that treatise, he says, is concerned with "eternal salvation, the highest development of man's potentialities, everlasting peace, unity and harmony, the delicate balance of abstract relations between Church and State." But Dante's real purpose—or at least the practical effect of his book—was to offer an impassioned defense of the Holy Roman Empire as opposed not only to the papacy but also to the welfare of the free Italian cities. The practical aims of the real argument . . . emerge as vicious and reactionary. They are the aims of an embittered and incompetent set of traitors."

It is possible that Mr. Burnham's own book may be open to the same sort of analysis. Ostensibly it is devoted to explaining the theories of Machiavelli and four of his modern followers: Mosca, Sorel, Michels and Pareto. Ostensibly its only purpose outside of pure exposition is to show how those theories apply to our present dilemmas. Ostensibly the book is free from emotion, being nothing but the dispassionate, cold, realistic statement of incontrovertible facts and the hypotheses to which they give rise by a wholly logical process of induction. Yet the scientific attitude is often used in our day exactly as godly sentiments were used in the Middle Ages—that is, as a handsome disguise for arguments that would be rejected if they appeared in their own workday clothes.

What first puts the reader on guard is Mr. Burnham's approach to Mosca, Sorel, Michels and Pareto, which is quite different from his approach to Dante. This time there is no question of explaining their social background or their political affiliations. Mr. Burnham says that, because the formal aims of these true Machiavellians coincided with their real aims, no such explanation is needed; and therefore he treats their theories as impersonally as if he were expounding Euclid. Yet the reader might have liked to know that Sorel, for example, was one of Mussolini's guides to action, that Pareto was named as a member of the Fascist Senate (although he died before taking his seat) and that Michels' "iron law of oligarchy" was used by the Nazis to justify their principle of leadership from above. Without bothering to mention that all four authors are generally regarded as the intellectual precursors of fascism Mr. Burnham presents them as the true defenders of freedom.

That raises the general question of his scientific objectivity. In the last and most important section of "The Machiavellians," he lists thirteen principles which, he says, have the force of scientific laws. They are not stated in anything that we have learned to recognize as scientific language. The sixth principle, to mention one example, is that "Historical and political science is above all the study of the elite, its composition, its structure and the mode of its relation to the non-elite." What is the scientific meaning of "above all"? Just how are we to recognize the elite? And, to depart from semantic questions, what about the influence of the masses on their leaders, which some political scientists believe to be the most striking feature of twentieth-century politics? Mr. Burnham might as well have said that physiology is *above all* the study of the brain.

Most of his other twelve principles reveal similar faults when judged as science or logic. Either they are too vague and general for any practical application, or else they state half the truth at the expense of the other half, or else they depend on the metaphysical theory that man is by nature anti-social and wicked, which is exactly as unscientific as the opposite theory that man is fundamentally good. Most of the principles are phrased in such rhetorical terms that they have little value as statements of fact. Principle Eight combines all these faults in eleven words when it says that "The rule of the elite is based upon force and fraud." Both "force" and "fraud" are highly emotive terms, and a political scientist trying to express the same idea would have preferred some neutral phrase like "power and ideology." But a political scientist would have been almost certain to add that the lasting rule of any elite is also based on cohesion, self-discipline and service to the state.

"The present revolution," Mr. Burnham says, "was in fact anticipated and its general course predicted by the modern Machiavellians more than a generation ago. Their predictions are, indeed, a powerful confirmation of their principles." Perhaps this is true, but Mr. Burnham offers little evidence to prove it. In his own book, "The Managerial Revolution," which was published a few weeks after Pearl Harbor, he offered a number of predictions based on what he regarded as scientific laws. He predicted, for example, that the war would inevitably lead to the formation of three super-states which would divide the world among them. The nuclei of these three super-states would be "the previously existing nations, Japan, Germany and the United States." Russia, after breaking apart, would be divided between Germany and Japan. Britain would lose —in fact she had already lost forever—her hold on the European continent, which would be consolidated under German rule. The British Empire had fallen to pieces like Humpty Dumpty. At home, the United States was undergoing a managerial revolution which would be similar in its effects to the revolution that had already taken place in Russia and Germany. The American leaders of this world revolution were the New Dealers, whom he described as "the younger group of administrators, experts, technicians, bureaucrats who have been finding places throughout the state apparatus . . . those who are doing the actual running of the extending government enter-

[1] The Machiavellians: Defenders of Liberty, by James Burnham. New York: The John Day Company. 278 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prises: in short, the managers." Congress had lost and would never regain its former powers. The 1940 campaign "may well have been the last regular presidential election in the history of this country, or, at most, the next to last." It would be risky to say that none of these predictions will ever be realized, but every one of them is farther from realization today than it was two years ago. A child making predictions about similar matters might be right in half of them, simply by the law of averages. It takes a very erudite political theorist to be wrong in every case.

But although "The Managerial Revolution" had little value as political science, and only negative value as a picture of things to come, it proved to be extremely effective as a campaign document. The business interests were looking for some new weapon against Roosevelt, and Mr. Burnham furnished it with his statement that the New Deal was part of the same process as communism and fascism and that the New Dealers were preparing to rule without elections. His book was carefully read by the newspaper editors, chamber-of-commerce secretaries and conservative members of Congress. Every day on the editorial page, The New York Daily News repeated his prediction about there being no more elections. Said Martin Dies, at the beginning of the long speech that he delivered on February 1, "The protection of individual rights . . . has been challenged for a long time by a new philosophy which in one country is communism, in another country fascism, in another country Nazism, and in another country bureaucracy," by which, of course, he meant the New Deal. He went on to develop Mr. Burnham's principal argument, before demanding a purge of government employees.

Mr. Dies and his brain trust will find new material in "The Machiavellians." Here, in the course of expounding the political theories of Mosca, Sorel, Michels and Pareto, Mr. Burnham quietly advances a theory of his own. Briefly stated, it is that Germany, Italy and Japan are not the enemies we have to fight. The real enemy is a movement which he now calls Bonapartism, and which, he says, is represented in varying degrees by Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany and the New Deal. Bonapartism is the inevitable result of any movement toward democratic self-government. "When we translate formal meanings into real meanings, by the method used in Part I to unravel Dante's politics, 'the people's century,' 'the century of the common man,' become . . . variant expressions the real meaning of which is 'the century of political Bonapartism' or 'the Bonapartist state.' . . . Vice President Wallace . . . is the major prophet, in this country, of the Bonapartist *mystique*." In other words, Germany and Japan are distant threats. The democrats, not the fascists, are the real dangers to freedom. The leader of the enemy is not Hitler but Vice President Wallace.

This is the practical message of a book that purports to be a study in scientific politics and, at the end, a plea for liberty. The best comment on it was written by Mr. Burnham himself, when he was analyzing "De Monarchia." "The real meaning," he said, "is expressed and projected indirectly through the formal meaning, and is supported by nothing more than emotion, prejudice and confusion. The real aims are thus intellectually irresponsible. . . . When we dig behind the formal façade, they emerge as vicious and reactionary."

MALCOLM COWLEY

Milton and Our War

Chariot of Wrath: The Message of John Milton to Democracy at War, by G. Wilson Knight. London: Faber and Faber. 194 pages. 10 shillings, sixpence.

THE "MESSAGE" which Wilson Knight extracts from Milton is that Messiah is to be equated with Great Britain; that the "war in heaven" is prophetic of our own war since the good angels who trust in God have to learn that the evil angels "are characterized by skill in mechanical warfare"; and that such conflict is archetypal since there has been "continual tension, as Tennyson so profoundly realized, between the British conscience and Machiavellian Europe." To be sure, Mr. Knight's vision is not sustained in such utter black and white terms. He is by no means naïve: the attitude from which his book springs is one of esthetic subtlety that remakes the world of fact and the world of imagination in patterns according to his own desire. He realizes that one difficulty for his analogy of a Holy War is that "today a pagan power-worship challenges an established, but weakening, Christian order." He also sees in Satan not only traits of Hitler, but, at times, even traits of Cromwell. That marks the particular twist in his approach to Milton, who, Mr. Knight is convinced, was basically a royalist. He believes that the poet came to realize the evils of any revolution, since denial of authority can only lead to its restoration. Mr. Knight indicates his own standards of value when he couples together "the authentic in literature and the authoritative in government." We are not surprised to find him saying thereafter that "democracy is not enough," or glowing with romantic fervor over what he calls the "magical" word, empire.

It would hardly be worth while to spend time here in refuting Mr. Knight's curious view of Milton's politics, since it seems sufficiently clear that despite the poet's many disillusionments he did not swerve from his conviction that "a commonwealth is a more perfect form of government than a monarchy." The really important issue raised by this book is the type of confusions it represents, a type of which we had enough examples from our professors during the last war to have remained, one would have hoped, as a permanent warning. This does not mean that what Mr. Knight is trying to affirm can be lightly dismissed. Milton would have agreed that a central function for the poetic imagination is "to fuse goodness with power." The great weakness of our recent liberalism, as Mr. Knight has recognized, is its dread of power, its unwillingness to face the fact that power has to be accepted and used for good ends unless it is to be used for bad. Mr. Knight's challenge to the historians and critics of our literature is that they haven't taken its meaning seriously enough, that they have refused to face, say, the dramatic implications of the Miltonic struggle between reason and passion for our own lives. As long as Mr. Knight confined himself to the texture of given works of art—as he did in his first studies of Shakespeare a decade ago—he was an invigorating interpreter of created structures.

But he has undergone a sad and symptomatic decline in his irresponsibility to the evidence before him. He has ignored Milton's own belief that "words must be con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formable to things, not things to words." He explicitly allows himself now "an interpretative freedom," and his free-wheeling analogies end with only coincidental resemblance to their alleged subject. In this Mr. Knight represents merely the purple extreme of the recent tendency to manipulate history into "the usable past." The practice of most writers who employ that term is to pick from the past simply those aspects which seem to coincide with our present hopes. The greatest danger in that practice is not that it oversimplifies the past, but that it also distorts our whole image of life by robbing history of its toughness.

Milton has much to teach us about the nature of liberty that is obscured by Mr. Knight's fancy version. The poet knew that liberty "hath a sharp and double edge," and can be handled only by men who are firmly disciplined to its duties no less than to its privileges. He grasped another truth in his warning to the King: "You cannot be truly free unless we are free too; for such is the nature of things, that he who intrenches on the liberty of others, is the first to lose his own and become a slave"—a truth which can still be serviceable to us in our dealings with the Negroes, and to the British in India. In the few passages where Mr. Knight dwells on some of Milton's great recurrent images, on his way, for example, of coupling light with strength, he suggests the dynamic symbol that a poet's work can become for later imaginations. From the "Areopagitica" to "Samson Agonistes," Milton could see in his mind "a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks." It was to such a vision that Wordsworth responded in his "Sonnets on Independence and Liberty":

> Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour:
> England hath need of thee. . . .

And despite the narrowness of Milton's psychology, we can still learn from him, as both Hawthorne and Melville did, that good and evil "grow up together almost inseparably," and are so "interwoven" that Adam's "doom" of "knowing good and evil" may well be called man's fate "of knowing good by evil." Meditating on such passages, we may repossess Milton for the wholeness of our needs. But when Mr. Knight gushes that "the present world-combat" is "a wrestling of flesh and blood, a flaming love-intercourse," Milton could not recognize himself in such a "message." Nor, unfortunately, is Mr. Knight's tone very distinguishable from the apocalyptic anti-intellectualism of many literary fascists. F. O. MATTHIESSEN

Winter Soldiers

Mutiny in January, by Carl Van Doren. New York: The Viking Press. 288 pages. $3.50.

THE "IDES OF JANUARY," 1781, almost brought disaster to the American cause less than a year before the victory at Yorktown ensured the independence of the United States. As Washington and many other patriots feared, internal weaknesses—the depreciation of the currency, the failure of Congress and the states to provide money and supplies for the army, the breakdown in transport—nearly succeeded in wrecking the American army where British arms and intrigue had failed. During the War of Independence, civilians expected the soldiers to shoulder, together with their muskets and knapsacks, all the hardships of the struggle, and as a result the "more than Roman virtue" of the officers and men was severely tried. Valley Forge was merely one instance—frequently repeated—of distress produced by the neglect, incapacity or indifference of the Continental Congress and the state legislatures.

Late in 1780, the condition of the troops of the Pennsylvania Line had become intolerable. "Moneyless, empty-belly'd and . . . bare A——d," the soldiers also nursed grievances against their officers over their terms of enlistment. These discontents culminated in a mutiny of the Pennsylvania Line on New Year's Day, 1781, and for a time it seemed likely that disaffection would spread over the entire American army. Clinton, the British commander in New York, attempted to persuade the mutineers to join forces with the British, but the soldiers, although now in rebellion against Congress and the state of Pennsylvania, were not eager to return to British allegiance. Instead, they turned over to the military authorities to be hanged as spies the men Clinton sent among them. The Pennsylvania soldiers were not turncoats; but on the other hand, they stood firm in their refusal to fight as long as they were defrauded of their pay, kept on the verge of starvation and ill treated by their officers. Congress, not daring to attempt to crush

The Book Club You've Been Waiting For Offers

WIDE IS THE GATE

By the Pulitzer Prize Winner

UPTON SINCLAIR

A story of naked power and hidden daring in the era of appeasement—the latest of Upton Sinclair's great novels

WHAT IS THE BOOK FIND CLUB?

BOOK FIND CLUB is aware of today's important events. It realizes that "books are weapons" in this great struggle. The Club's selections are books that will help to further the progress of the "common man."

You can obtain these worthwhile books each month at a price you can easily afford. Mail coupon today!

PAST SELECTIONS

THE GREAT OFFENSIVE by Max Werner
SENSATION FAIR by Ergon Kisch
DAWN BREAKS by F. C. Weiskopf
VILLAGE IN AUGUST by T'ien Chun
ONLY THE STARS ARE NEUTRAL by Quentin Reynolds
THE EDGE OF THE SWORD by Vladimir Pozner

FREE MEMBERSHIP COUPON

BOOK FIND CLUB, Dept. NR
112 East 19th Street
New York, N. Y.

Please enroll me as a member. It is understood that you will mail me the BOOK FIND selection each month, for which I will pay the special membership price of $1.25 (plus 10c handling and postage charge). It is also understood that if I do not wish to keep the book I will return it within 5 days. I agree to purchase a minimum of 4 books a year.

☐ Please send more information about BOOK FIND CLUB.

☐ Enclosed please find $1.35 (check or money order) for my initial selection.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY AND STATE.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the outbreak with force, was obliged to temporize with the mutineers; negotiations were begun between the leaders of the troops and a committee of Congress and a settlement was patched up which, for the moment, appeased the soldiers. But Congress' troubles with the American army were by no means at an end; in 1783 the soldiers were again in a mutinous frame of mind and there was grave danger that Congress would be overthrown and a military dictatorship established.

Mr. Van Doren has added fresh and significant detail to the story of this "critical period" of the revolutionary war. It cannot be said, however, that he has written an interesting or readable book. Mr. Van Doren deliberately avoids the colorful and the dramatic; his purpose is rather to bring the reader as closely as possible to the events with which he deals by extensive quotations from source material. But this method runs the risk of bogging down the reader in a mass of details and nonessentials—a fault which marred "The Secret History of the American Revolution" and is repeated in "Mutiny in January." The trick of quotation *in extenso* worked well in "Benjamin Franklin" because here Mr. Van Doren was working with one of the literary masters of the period; but it fails lamentably when applied to Clinton, Washington and Wayne, whose swords were obviously greater than their pens. Instead, the result is historical writing of a singularly dull and prosaic character. Mr. Van Doren's service has been to bring hitherto unused materials of history—chiefly at the William L. Clements Library—to attention, not to illumine a period with the penetrating insight of a great scholar and historian.

JOHN C. MILLER

Synthetic Misanthrope

The Autobiography of a Curmudgeon, by Harold L. Ickes. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock. 343 pages. $3.

FOR A DECADE, Harold L. Ickes, charter member of the New Deal, has presided over that political plum and repository of skeletons, the Department of the Interior. He directed, with distinguished integrity, the greatest peacetime public-works program in the history of the nation. He attained the sobriquet of "Tsar"—over petroleum, the lifeblood of modern locomotion. But if you want to know about his experiences in these seats of the mighty, you had better turn to his biographers, not to his Autobiography.

Harold Ickes, as he himself suggests rather explicitly, is no Raymond Moley. His book is devoid of curtain-lifting disclosures about his administration colleagues. It tells little about the problems and accomplishments of his unprecedented tenure in the Cabinet. Rather curiously, the PWA achievement in which he seems to find the greatest satisfaction is its allocation of $237,000,000 in 1933 to the navy for the building of warships. Where would we be, Mr. Ickes asks from the vantage-point of the present, if "we had not started to get ready for war when we did *nearly ten years ago!*"

A good deal of the Autobiography is concerned with minutiae of Chicago mayoralty campaigns which may prove less than engrossing to contemporary readers. Back in the first decades of the century, Chicagoans, who just last month reëlected Ed Kelly, perversely insisted on choosing such men as Fred Busse and Big Bill Thompson to head their municipal government. Harold Ickes directed campaigns to elect men like John Maynard Harlan and Charles E. Merriam, whom he regarded as knights in shining armor. But Harlan failed to follow all details of the Ickesian counsel and fudged a bit on the traction issue. Merriam was knifed in the back by the Republican machine; some people, of whom Ickes was emphatically not one, were inclined to blame his defeat upon his campaign manager.

Nominally a Republican, Ickes managed to be pretty consistently on the outs with his party, nationally as well as locally. He voted for Bryan in 1908 and ardently backed Theodore Roosevelt in the split of 1912; *faute de mieux* he supported Hughes in 1916 because he was impatient with Woodrow Wilson; unable to stomach Harding, he publicly declared himself for Cox in 1920, was for La Follette in 1924 and for Al Smith in 1928. The two individuals who commanded his greatest enthusiasm during this period were T. R. and Hiram Johnson. In those days, as he confesses candidly and contritely, he was an isolationist.

The Autobiography's account of these political contests, local and national, is abundant in detail but lacking in perspective and in the sort of anecdotal material necessary to illuminate and revitalize issues of the past. Ickes expresses no social philosophy, save some nebulous platitudes. Indeed, he saw events more in terms of the personalities than of the issues involved. Yet he shows little aptitude for imparting character and color to the people of his narrative; they remain mere names.

In some measure, no doubt, he deserved the epithet, reformer. He was "agin" corruption and in favor of clean government. But mostly he was "agin" the incumbents and in favor of the political underdog. He was generally more interested in the fight than in the finish. And he was never stuffily moral about it. "I confess," he said, "that I liked and enjoyed the company of the crooks. They had real human qualities—most of them."

Harold Ickes, the autobiographer, was profoundly influenced by his biographers in the daily newspapers. He has accepted their characterization of him and has come to relish it. Anyone who has seen him handle a press conference knows the zeal with which he strives to live up to his reputation as a curmudgeon. There is no doubt that he has been maligned and maltreated by the press. On the other hand, he has done his share to keep the feud alive.

Respecting newspapermen, Ickes is catholic in his distastes. But his fiercest spleen is reserved for Bertie McCormick and for Joe and Cissie Patterson. Out of his relationship with The Chicago Tribune, he notes, "has sprung one of the happiest and most satisfying feuds of my career." And it is a source of inordinate glee to him that The Tribune once paid him $35 in a single week at space rates during his early newspaper days in Chicago. He is sensitive about his journalistic career and proud of the fact that he was covering national conventions three years after he was graduated from college.

This man is by nature a rough-and-tumble fighter. He can take punishment and come up grinning. While his verbal blows sometimes have the restraint and delicacy of block-busters, they often possess a robust and engaging humor. If he has an outward churlishness, he also has qualities of warmth and forthrightness. He was quoted the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other day as offering this explanation of how he came to write his memoirs: "Eighteen months ago I was sick—and I didn't know what kind of obituary I'd get." News is only the first rough draft of history. One can imagine that the draft will be revised and the title of his Autobiography refuted when obituaries at last come to be written for Harold Ickes.

ALAN BARTH

A Reader's List

RETAIL DISTRIBUTION AND TOWN PLANNING (Political and Economic Planning Number 202. Available from The New Republic, 25 cents). In this age of pamphlets, what group rivals the British PEP people in freshness of imagination in the choice of subject matter? This broadsheet examines the question of retail stores, in relationship to the problem of post-war planning. The survey upon which it is based refers almost wholly to British retail establishments; but the analysis and the conclusion are relevant and stimulating to a study of the American problem. The number of retailers who have closed their doors during the war in both countries suggests how real the post-war problem, and the opportunity for intelligent planning, will be.

WE FIGHT WITH MERCHANT SHIPS, by M. B. Palmer (Bobbs-Merrill, $2.75). This workmanlike story of the effect of two wars upon our merchant marine provides excellent reportorial coverage of the men who build, sail, manage and write laws about ships. Its amiable impartiality toward all parties involved sometimes creaks at the seams, but on most matters the book is highly informative.

AIRING IN A CLOSED CARRIAGE, by Joseph Shearing (Harpers, $2.50). While keeping to authenticated incidents, the author has supplied the background and psychological interpretation to make a persuasive and poignant novel from a much debated English murder trial of the eighties. May Tyler, the convent-reared Virginia girl married at seventeen to a boorish, middle-aged cotton merchant and eight years later convicted of his murder, emerges from the lies and contradictions in which the case was buried a pathetic and arresting figure. One of Mr. Shearing's best.

OPENING . . . for THE SUMMER SEASON
COMMENCING . . .
DECORATION DAY
PLAN YOUR SUMMER VACATION NOW!
LESS TO MEMBERS OF ALL UNIONS
Write for Illustrated Booklet
N. Y. OFFICE
3 WEST 16th ST.
WAtkins 9-6868
UNITY HOUSE
FOREST PARK
PENNSYLVANIA
Owned and Operated by
I. L. G. W. U. ON NON-PROFIT BASIS
ALFRED A. TAXIN, Manager
MAKE RESERVATIONS NOW!
BUY WAR BONDS

Timberland
POTTERSVILLE, N. Y.
AN ADULT CAMP IN THE ADIRONDACKS
LIMITED TO 100
Opens May 15 for the Season
SPECIAL DECORATION DAY WEEKEND
SPORTS • LECTURES • MUSIC • CONCERTS
N. Y. Office: 33F West 42nd Street, LOngacre 5-3674
Directors: Harry N. Boardman—Louis A. Rothblatt
The Rare Charm of an Intimate Congenial Group

CAMP UNITY
UNITY Opens
DECORATION DAY
WEEK-END
CASS CARR
And His Band
AL MOSS LAURA DUNCAN
Handball Concerts Swimming
Tennis Revues Boating
Horseshes Swell Food Baseball
at Wingdale, only 70 miles from New York (N. Y. C. R. R.)
RATES, $5.50 Day; $30 Week
MAKE RESERVATIONS NOW!
N. Y. Office: 1 Union Square, AL 4-8024
CAMP UNITY
WINGDALE, N. Y.
OFF. 1 UNION SQ.
N. Y. C. - AL 1-8021

Mills 7895. Your Hostess: FANNIE GOLDBERG
A VACATION HAVEN 40 MILES FROM N. Y.
Birdland
CENTRAL VALLEY N. Y.
Formerly Lewisohn's Estate OPEN ALL YEAR
225-acre estate of fascinating hiking country. Tennis, Golf, Handball, Bicycles, Ping-pong. Games, recordings, library, dancing. Open fireplaces. Excellent cuisine. Every comfort. Incomparable surroundings. Tel.: Highland

SOUTH WIND
WOODBOURNE, N. Y.
P. O. N 38
A country estate on top of a mountain, with its private lake, offers all facilities for sport and relaxation.
Reservations for Decoration Day Week-end
PHONE WOODBOURNE 1025

WALTELL HOUSE
FRANKEL FARM MT. BETHEL, PA.
The only modern farm hotel combined with a children's day camp. All sports. Meats, Poultry, Eggs and Fresh Vegetables from the farm.
Your Hostess: ELLA FRANKEL
BOOKLET — Write or phone Bangor 62-T-3
N. Y. C. Tel.: LExington 2-5864

War Bonds and Stamps
Buy a share in AMERICA. Invest in your country and help win the war. Get the Victory Habit—buy War Bonds and Stamps every pay day.

Contemporary
JEWISH RECORD
"A MAGAZINE OF REAL DIGNITY AND WORTH"
—WALDO FRANK

- Significant articles by such writers as Salo W. Baron, Waldo Frank, Louis Golding, Thomas Mann.
- "The Cedars of Lebanon," a series of timely interpretations of Judaism.
- March of Events, the news in concise form—country by country.
- Magazine Digest.
- Book Reviews.

In the Current Issue
The Story Behind Giraud's Abrogation of the Crémieux Decree ..... Hannah Arendt
Palestine: Commonwealth or Bi-National State? ..... Erich Kahler
New Forces in American Art. Illustrated ..... William Schack
Writing American Jewish History ..... Harold J. Jonas
The Cedars of Lebanon: Jewish Ideals ..... Joseph Jacobs

CONTEMPORARY JEWISH RECORD, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Please start my subscription with the issue described above. I enclose $2 for 1 year (6 issues).
Name ..... City .....
Address ..... State .....
NR5173

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contributors

HELEN FULLER is a member of the editorial staff in our Washington office and is a regular contributor to The New Republic.

TOM BOGGS has two books coming out in June: his first book of verse, "Forty-one Poems" (Coward-McCann), and his fourth modern anthology, "American Decades" (Cummington Press).

PAOLO MILANO, an Italian dramatic critic, is now teaching Romance Languages at Queens College, New York City.

POTOMACUS is a pseudonym that will be used on articles about Washington personalities and events, when for various reasons it is inexpedient to reveal the name of the author.

F. O. MATTHIESSEN is professor of American Literature and History at Harvard University. His most recent book is "American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman."

JOHN C. MILLER, sometime Junior Fellow, Society of Fellows, Harvard University, is now assistant professor of American History at Bryn Mawr College. He is the author of "Sam Adams: Pioneer in Propaganda" and his new book, "Origins of the American Revolution," is a Book-of-the-Month-Club choice, soon to be released.

ALAN BARTH until recently was with the Office of War Information and prior to that was a Washington correspondent for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate. At present he is an editorial writer for The Washington Post. He has contributed to The New Republic, The Nation, The Public Opinion Quarterly and a number of other magazines.

Now Playing

"HAS NO HESITANCY WHATEVER IN STEPPING ON A FEW TENDER TOES!"—N. Y. Times

WARNER BROS.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

The thrilling report by former United States Ambassador JOSEPH E. DAVIES

Directed by MICHAEL CURTIZ

WALTER HUSTON · ANN HARDING · GEORGE TOBIAS · OSCAR HOMOLKA · GENE LOCKHART · HELMUT DANTINE

HOLLYWOOD THEATRE BROADWAY at 51st STREET

CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCES · POPULAR PRICES

DOORS OPEN 10 A.M.

LANGUAGES

SPANISH by LINGUAPHONE

The quick, easy, correct way to speak any of 29 languages. World famous Linguaphone Ear-Eye method brings voices of native teachers *into your own home.* *Send for FREE Book*

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
86 R.C.A. Building New York City

LADY DESIRES EXCHANGE Russian lessons, reading French, German for conversational English with cultured middle-aged person. Address Box 364, The New Republic.

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSE. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

HOME WANTED

8-YEAR-OLD AMERICAN BOY, free for adoption, attractive appearance, good potentialities, over-active, rebellious; needs understanding foster parents who are willing to help a promising boy through a difficult phase. State Charities Aid Adoption Committee, 105 East 22nd St., N. Y. C.

LITERARY SERVICE

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

SUMMER RENTAL

RAINY LAKE, Ranier, Minn. Island home, consisting of three cabins fully equipped. $500 inclusive for season. Address: "Mallard," Ranier, Minnesota.

CANOE CRUISES

HARVARD graduate in conservation work, making extensive canoe cruises this summer in Minnesota-Ontario Lakeland, will take one or two boys. 8 weeks. $450. 35 years' experience. Address: Box 362, The New Republic.

GO PLACES WITH BOOKS

What do *you* like about travelling. . . . Meeting people? Seeing things? Getting out of your own particular rut? Wartime restrictions may keep you at home, but you can find these thrills and more right in your living room between the covers of a good Book. Let your bookseller be your guide.

AMERICAN BOOKSELLERS ASSN.
MEMBERS EVERYWHERE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED